

Durham E-Theses

The concealed messiahship in the synoptic gospels and the significance of this for the study of the life of Jesus and of the church

Glasswell, Mark Errol

How to cite:

Glasswell, Mark Errol (1965) *The concealed messiahship in the synoptic gospels and the significance of this for the study of the life of Jesus and of the church*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/7982/>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

Academic Support Office, Durham University, University Office, Old Elvet, Durham DH1 3HP
e-mail: e-theses.admin@dur.ac.uk Tel: +44 0191 334 6107
<http://etheses.dur.ac.uk>

Abstract of thesis for Ph. D. by M.B. Glasswell, entitled "The Concealed Messiahship in the Synoptic Gospels and the Significance of this for a Study of the Life of Jesus and of the Church."

The theme of the messianic secret has been a vexed ~~and~~ question of gospel exegesis ever since the independent and contradictory work of Wrede and Schweitzer. Since then opinions have moved between seeing it as a dogmatic element in the redaction of Mark, reflecting the fact that Jesus' life was unmessianic and that he only came to be regarded as Messiah at the resurrection, and seeing it as belonging to the pattern of his own life and necessitated by the sort of Messiah he saw himself as being. The latter view saw the secret as only dispelled at the resurrection, after the passion, when the truth could be disclosed. But the question remains why it could not have been disclosed earlier and why the theme is so difficult to understand in the gospel-narrative in a purely historical manner, without reading connections and motives into it.

Matthew and Luke both alter the Marcan theme considerably either because they did not understand it or thought it inappropriate. They do so, however, in accordance with quite definite doctrinal viewpoints of their own. Indeed the Marcan theme seems itself to reflect a dogmatic position which is that of the evangelist rather than Jesus himself. Messiahship as such seems to be rejected by Jesus in Mark and regarded as inappropriate during his earthly life. It is replaced by a more transcendental concept, i.e. of the Son of Man, dependent itself, as a description of Jesus, on his prior death and resurrection. It is this too that Matthew and Luke develop in their reinterpretation of the Marcan theme of secrecy with regard to Jesus' messiahship. It is therefore suggested that the secrecy-theme in Mark excludes any purely historical approach to the question of Jesus' messiahship, based on his earthly life, as against one based on faith in the resurrection and the church's post-resurrection Gospel, of which Jesus' life is only the presupposition. Matthew has theologized this into an account of secret revelation in history and Luke has historicized it in terms of a history which must precede the Gospel-kerygma. In each case the theme is important for the evangelists' understanding of his task in relating Gospel to history and of the ^{actual} relation between them.

THESIS SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR of PHILOSOPHY.

1965.

Title:- THE CONCEALED MESSIAHSHIP IN THE SYNOPTIC
GOSPELS AND THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THIS FOR THE
STUDY OF THE LIFE OF JESUS AND OF THE CHURCH.

by Mark Errol Glasswell, B.A.

Contents.

Introduction.	i	-	ii
Chapter One - The discussion from Wrede to Burkill.	1	-	83
Chapter Two - The Concealed Messiahship in Mark.	84	-	211 ²⁷⁴
Chapter Three - The Concealed Messiahship in Matthew.	212 ²⁷⁵	-	399
Chapter Four - The Concealed Messiahship in Luke.	400	-	470
Chapter Five - Conclusions.	471	-	503
Bibliography.			

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bacon, B.W. The Gospel of Mark. U.S.A. 1925
- " Studies in Matthew. New York. 1930
- Baldensperger, W. Review of Wrede in Theologische Literaturzeitung 27. 1902, pp. 393 ff.
- Barrett, C.K. The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition. London. 1947, 1954.
- " 'The Background of Mk. x. 45' - New Testament Essays (in memory of T.W. Manson). pp. 1-18.
- " 'Stephen and the Son of man'. - Apophoreta. Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen. Berlin 1964. pp. 32ff.
- Barth, G. see Bornkamm.
- Barth, K. Der Römerbrief. Munchen. 1926;
The Epistle to the Romans. Oxford. 1933
- Bauer, B. Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte der Synoptiker. 3 vols. Leipzig. 1841-2.
- Bickermann, E. 'Das Messiasgeheimnis und die Komposition des Markusevangeliums.' - Z.N.W. 19, 1919-1920, pp. 169ff.
- Bornkamm, G. 'Die Verzögerung der Parusie.'
In Memoriam Ernst Lohmeyer. 1951
- " Jesus von Nazareth. 1956; Jesus of Nazareth. London. 1960.
- " 'Enderwartung und Kirche im Matthäusevangelium.' - The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology. Essays in Honour of C.H. Dodd. pp. 222ff.
- " 'Evangelien'. - R.G.G. 3rd. ed. vol. II.
- Bornkamm, G, -
Barth, G.-Held H.J. Überlieferung und Auslegung im Matthäusevangelium. 1960; Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew. London 1963.

- Bousset, W. 'Das Messiasgeheimnis'. - Theologische Rundschau. 27, 1902, pp. 307-316, 347-362.
- " Was wissen wir von Jesus? - 1904
- " Jesus. Tübingen 1907, London 1906 (from earlier editions).
- " Kyrios Christos. Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Urchristentums bis Irenaeus. Göttingen 1913, 1921, 1926.
- Bultmann, R. 'Die Frage nach dem messianischen Bewusstsein Jesu und das Petrus-Bekenntnis'. Z.N.W. 19, 1919-20.
- " Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition. Göttingen 1931, 1961; The history of the Synoptic Tradition. Oxford. 1963.
- " Jesus. Berlin 1926, 1934; Jesus and the Word. London. 1935.
- " Theologie des neuen Testaments. Tübingen 1953; Theology of the New Testament. London I 1952, II 1955.
- " Das Verhältnis der urchristlichen Christusbotschaft zum historischen Jesus. Heidelberg 1962.
- " πλοτεώω TWNT VI., Faith. Bible Key Words.
- Burkill, T.A. 'Strain on the Secret.' Z.N.W. 51, 1960, pp. 31ff.
- " 'The hidden Son of Man in St. Mark's Gospel.' Z.N.W. 52, 1961, pp. 189ff.
- " Mysterious Revelation, An Examination of the Philosophy of St. Mark's Gospel. New York. 1963.

- Caird, G.B. The Gospel of St. Luke. London. 1963
- Cranfield, C.E.B. The Gospel according to St. Mark.
Cambridge. 1959.
- Conzelmann, H. Die Mitte der Zeit. Studien zur Theologie
des Lukas. Tübingen. 1954; The Theology
of St. Luke. London. 1960.
- " 'Gegenwart und Zukunft in der synoptischen
Tradition.' Z.Th.K. 54, 1957, pp.277ff.
- " 'Geschichte und Eschaton nach Mk.13.'
Z.N.W. 1959
- " 'Jesus Christus.' R.G.G. III pp. 619ff.
- " 'Zur Methode der Leben-Jesu-Forschung.'
Die Frage nach dem historischen Jesus.
Z.Th.K. 56, 1959, Beiheft 1, pp. 2ff.
- Cullmann, O. Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments.
Tübingen, 1957; The Christology of the
New Testament. London. 1959.
- Dahl, N.A. 'The Parables of Growth'. Studia
Theologica 5, 1952.
- " 'Der gekreuzigte Messias.' Der historische
Jesus und der kerygmatische Christus.
Berlin, 1960, pp. 149ff.
- Daube, D. The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism.
London. 1956.
- Dibelius, M. Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums.
Tübingen. 1933, 1961; From Tradition
to Gospel. London. 1934.
- " Jesus. 1939. London. 1963.
- Ebeling, H.J. Das Messiasgeheimnis und die Botschaft
des Marcus-Evangelisten. Beiheft zur
Z.N.W. 19, Berlin. 1939.
- Evans, C.F. 'I will go before you into Galilee.'
J.T.S. V, 1954.

- Fenton, J. The Gospel of St. Matthew. London. 1963.
- Fuchs, E. 'Die der Theologie durch die historisch-kritische Methode auferlegte Besinnung.' Zur Frage nach dem historischen Jesus. Tübingen, 1960, pp. 219ff; The Reflection which is imposed on Theology by the historical-critical Method.' Studies in the historical Jesus. London. 1964.
- " 'Das Geschichtsverständnis Jesu'. *ibid.*;
'Jesus' Understanding of Time.' *ibid.*
- Gerhardsson, B. Memory and Manuscript. Uppsala. 1961.
- Gibbs, J.M. 'Purpose and Pattern in Matthew's use of the title "Son of David";' N.T.S. 10, 1964.
- Gloege, G. Aller Tage Tag. Stuttgart, 1960;
The Day of his Coming. London. 1963.
- Grässer, E. Das Problem der Parusieverzögerung in den synoptischen Evangelien und in der Apostelgeschichte. Beiheft zur Z.N.W. 22, Berlin. 1957.
- Haenchen, E. Die Apostelgeschichte. Göttingen. 1959.
- Hahn, F. Christologische Hoheitstitel. Göttingen 1963.
- Held, H.J. see Bornkamm.
- Hirsch, E. Frühgeschichte des Evangeliums I, Das Werden des Markus Evangeliums. Tübingen 1941, 1951.
- Hooker, M. Jesus and the Servant. London. 1959.
- Jeremias, J. Die Gleichnisse Jesu. Göttingen, 1958, 1960.
The Parables of Jesus. London. 1954, 1963.
- Jülicher, A. Die Aufgaben der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft in der Gegenwart. Göttingen 1908,
Die Gleichnisreden Jesu. Tübingen 1910.
- Kähler, M. Der sogenannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche, biblische Christus. Leipzig 1892, 1896. München, 1953, 1961.

- Käsemann, E. 'Das Problem der historischen Jesus.'
Z.Th.K. 51, 1954, and Exegetische Versuche
und Besinnungen. I Göttingen, 1960;
 'The Problem of the historical Jesus.'
Essays on New Testament Themes. London 1964.
- Klausner, J. Jesus of Nazareth, London, 1925.
- Klostermann, E. Das Markusevangelium. Tübingen 1926.
- " Das Matthäusevangelium. Tübingen, 1927.
- Kümmel, W.G. Verheissung und Erfüllung. Zürich, 1956.
 Promise and Fulfilment. London 1957.
- Lightfoot, R.H. History and Interpretation in the Gospels.
 London, 1935.
- " Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels.
 London, 1938.
- " The Gospel Message of St. Mark. Oxford 1950.
- Lohmeyer, E. Galiläa und Jerusalem. Göttingen 1936.
- " Das Evangelium des Markus. Göttingen 1937,
 1959. (Ergänzungsheft, ed. G. Sass, 1959)
- " Review of Ebeling, Theol.Literaturzeitung.
 65, 1940 pp. 18ff.
- " Gottesknecht und Davidsson. Stuttgart 1945,
 Göttingen, 1953.
- Lohmeyer, E -
 Schmauch, W. Das Evangelium des Matthäus. Göttingen, 1956.
- Manson, W. Jesus the Messiah. London, 1943.
- Manson, T.W. 'The Foundation of the synoptic Tradition:
 the Gospel of Mark.' 1944, in Studies in
the Gospels and Epistles. ed. M.Black.
 Manchester 1962.
- Marxsen, W. 'Redaktionsegeschichtliche Erklärung der
 sogenannten Parabeltheorie des Markus.'
Z.Th.K. 52, 1955, pp. 255ff.

- Marxsen, W. Der Evangelist Markus. Studien zur Redaktionsegeschichte des Evangeliums. Göttingen, 1959.
- " Anfangsprobleme der Christologie. Gütersloh, 1960.
- Maurenbrecher, M. Von Nazareth nach Golgotha. Eine Untersuchung über die weltgeschichtlichen Zusammenhang des Urchristentums. Berlin 1909.
- Nineham, D.E. The Gospel of St. Mark. London, 1963.
- Otto, R. Reich Gottes und Menschensohn. 1934, 1940.
The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man, 1938.
- Rawlinson, A.E.J. The Gospel according to St. Mark. London, 1925
- Riesenfeld, H. The Gospel Tradition and its Beginning. A study in the limits of 'Formgeschichte'. London, 1957, also in The Gospels Reconsidered. Oxford, 1960, pp.131ff.
- Robinson, J.M. The Problem of History in Mark. London 1957.
- " A. New Quest of the historical Jesus. London, 1959, and Kerygma und historischen Jesus, 1960.
- Percy, E. Die Botschaft Jesu. Eine traditionskritische und exegetische Untersuchung. Lund 1953.
- Sanday, W. The Life of Christ in recent Research. Oxford, 1907.
- Schlatter, A. Der Zweifel an der Messianität Jesu. 1907
Die Geschichte des Christus, 1923.
- Schmidt, K.L. Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu. Berlin 1919.
- Schniewind, J. Das Selbstzeugnis Jesu nach den drei ersten Evangelien. Berlin 1922.

- Schniewind, J. Das Evangelium nach Markus. Göttingen 1936
- " Das Evangelium nach Matthäus. Göttingen 1936.
- " 'Messiasgeheimnis und Eschatologie'. 1932
in Nachgelassene Reden und Aufsätzen.
Berlin 1952.
- Schweitzer, A. Das Messianitäts - und Leidengeheimnis.
Eine Skizze des Lebens Jesu. Tübingen
and Leipzig 1901; The Mystery of the
Kingdom of God, The Secret of Jesus'
Messiahship and Passion. London 1914, 1956.
- " Von Reimarus zu Wrede. Eine Geschichte
der Leben-Jesu-Forschung. Tübingen 1906;
The Quest of the historical Jesus. A
critical Study of its Progress from
Reimarus to Wrede. London 1910, 1956.
Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung.
Tübingen 1951.
- " Die psychiatrische Beurteilung Jesu.
Tübingen, 1913; The Psychiatric Study
of Jesus. Boston, 1948.
- Schweizer, E. 'Der Menschensohn. Zur eschatologischen
Erwartung Jesu.' Z.N.W. 50, 1959.
- " 'Mark's Contribution to the Quest of the
historical Jesus.' N.T.S. 1964.
- Sjöberg, E. Der Menschensohn im äthiopischen
Henochbuch. Lund, 1946.
Der verborgene Menschensohn in den
Evangelien. Lund, 1955.
- Strecker, G. 'William Wrede'. Z.Th.K. 1960.
- " Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit. Untersuchung
zur Theologie des Matthäus. Göttingen 1962.
- Taylor, Vincent. The Gospel according to St. Mark, London 1952.

- Tödt, H.E. Der Menschensohn in der synoptischen Überlieferung. Gutersloh, 1959.
- Turner, H.E.W. Jesus Master and Lord. London, 1953.
- " Historicity and the Gospels, London 1963.
- Tyrrell, G. Christianity at the Cross-Roads, London 1909.
ed. A.R. Vidler, 1963.
- Vielhauer, P. 'Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesu.' in Festschrift für Günther Dehn. 1957.
- " 'Jesus und der Menschensohn.' Z.Th.K.60, 1963.
- Völter, D. Das messianische Bewusstsein Jesu. Strassbourg. 1907.
- " Die Menschensohnfrage neuuntersucht. Leiden 1916.
- Weiss, J. Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes. Göttingen, 1892, 1900.
- " Das älteste Evangelium. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis des Markus-Evangeliums und der ältesten evangelischen Überlieferung. Göttingen, 1903.
- " Die Aufgaben der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft in der Gegenwart. Göttingen 1908.
- " Christus, Die Anfänge des Dogmas. Tübingen 1909; Christ. The Beginnings of Dogma. London 1911.
- " Jesus von Nazareth, Mythos oder Geschichte? 1910.
- Weiss, J. -
Knopf, R. Das Urchristentum. Göttingen 1917.
Earliest Christianity. New York 1959.
- Windisch, H. 'Der geschichtliche Jesus.' Theologische Rundschau. 1910.

- Winter, P. On the Trial of Jesus. Berlin 1961.
 Studia Judaica I.
- Wrede, W. Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien.
 Zugleich ein Beitrag zum Verständnis des
 Markusevangeliums. Göttingen 1901, 1913,
 1963.
- " 'Selbstanzeige'. Die christliche Welt.
 15, 1901.
- " 'Zur Messiaserkenntnis der Dämonen bei
 Markus';
- " 'Zur Heilung der Gelähmten' (Mk.ii. 1ff.)
 and 'Zum Thema "Menschensohn."'
 Z.N.W. V. 1904.
- " 'Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes'.
 Lectures 1894; and 'Jesus als Davidssohn'.
 in Vorträge und Studien (posth.)
 Tübingen 1907.

Abbreviations (for the above list and the main text).

- H.T.R.- Harvard Theological Review.
- J.T.S.- Journal of Theological Studies.
- N.T.S.- New Testament Studies.
- R.G.G.- Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart.
- TWNT. Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament.
 ed. G. Kittel, 1933 ff.
- Z.N.W. Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft.
- Z.Th.K. Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche.

Introduction.

Wrede's book on Mark's gospel¹ raised the question of the relation between the narrative account of that gospel and the life of Jesus and the relation between history and the messianic beliefs of the church. It did so by calling attention to the motifs of secrecy and lack of understanding in the gospel and suggested a conflict between the situation of Jesus' life and that of the post-resurrection church on the basis of the literary evidence of the gospel for the nature of the historical tradition behind it in its presentation of the church's post-resurrection faith in Jesus. The question of the origin of the title Messiah as applied to Jesus was not the main interest of the book, but the theory of the messianic secret came to represent the view that the church's faith in Jesus had its origin in the resurrection and not in Jesus' lifetime, on the basis of the negative aspect of the account of Peter's 'confession'.

Later work has gone on to question the relation between the gospels and the life of Jesus on the basis of more precise literary analysis, and to discuss the general question of the relation between history and the Gospel. The result has been a distinction between the literary gospels (distinguished in the following by a small 'g') and both the life of Jesus and the Gospel (with a capital 'G'), similar to the distinction between the life of Jesus and the Gospel

themselves, but also more recently, an assertion that the gospels are intended to show the relation between the life of Jesus, or the historical Jesus, and the Gospel. The point of this study is to show how the 'messianic secret' in the synoptic gospels not only raises the question of the nature of that relation, but also provides the answer.

¹Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien. see chapter 1 following.

THE CONCEALED MESSIAHSHIP IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS AND THE
IMPLICATIONS OF THIS FOR THE STUDY OF THE LIFE OF JESUS
AND OF THE CHURCH.

Chapter One. The discussion from Wrede to Burkill.

This discussion must begin with two books which appeared on the same day in 1901. These were Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien. Zugleich ein Beitrag zum Verständnis des Markusevangeliums. Göttingen 1901(1913, 1963), by William Wrede and Das Messianitäts-und Leidensgeheimnis. Eine Skizze des Lebens Jesu.¹ Tübingen and Leipzig 1901, second part of Das Abendmahl im Zusammenhang mit dem Leben Jesu und der Geschichte des Urchristentums by Albert Schweitzer. Both books attacked the current approach of the nineteenth-century liberals to the study of the life of Jesus and his messiahship by making significant use of material, mainly in the gospel of Mark, which was taken to imply a secret about Jesus' messiahship. But whilst Wrede treated the theme as the creation of the early church, Schweitzer interpreted it as a factor in the context of Jesus' earthly life. In different ways both made the figure of Jesus problematical for Christianity.

The joint significance of these two books over against previous work was stressed by Schweitzer himself in Von Reimarus zu Wrede. Eine Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung.² Tübingen 1906(1913, 1951 revised and extended) in chapter xix.

Here however Schweitzer had also to contrast the approach of Wrede, designated as 'thoroughgoing scepticism'- a judgement which he later modified-with his own, designated as 'thoroughgoing eschatology'. In method Schweitzer was no different from the liberals whom he attacks, whereas Wrede had made a significant critical departure. Wrede's book was concerned with the Marcan gospel³, whilst Schweitzer's was concerned with the life of Jesus. Whereas for Wrede the historical Jesus was problematical for later church dogma because his life was probably unmessianic; for Schweitzer it was the manner in which Jesus' messiahship was conceived in his lifetime which made him problematical. Wrede started from the gospel tradition and moved back into the dogma of the early church, whereas Schweitzer tried to explain the gospel material from the thought-world of Jesus himself and the outlines of his life. For Schweitzer the key to both was to be found in eschatology, which in his view explained the manner in which Jesus conceived of his messiahship.

The contrast between these two approaches is of importance for the subsequent discussion and for the theme of secrecy itself and we will examine the work of Schweitzer and of Wrede in some detail. Since Schweitzer really belongs

to the earlier period we will take him first.

For Schweitzer the gospel material was as far as possible to be explained from the outline of Jesus' life. The problem was to find the right principle from which to interpret, understand, and order the different elements in the story. Against the ethical understanding of Jesus' preaching and messiahship of the earlier liberals, Schweitzer set a thoroughly eschatological and apocalyptic one. In Jesus' lifetime the secret or mystery of the kingdom of God developed into the secret of the passion of Jesus and together these explain the secret of Jesus' messiahship. This was the secret which Judas betrayed⁴ and which brought the passion about. The eschatological event never did take place and Jesus receded into the mists of history. A gigantic system of dogma was built around his person. Eschatology was displaced by ethics which was formerly subordinate to it. But the concept of Jesus' messiahship had been initiated by Jesus himself⁵. The material in the gospels can be properly explained in terms of Jesus' earthly life⁶. The key to this life is the secret of Jesus' messiahship, understood in terms of eschatology and apocalyptic.

Jesus' messiahship had to remain a secret in his lifetime in order to be properly fulfilled in the future⁷. This future, and at present secret, messiahship was understood

and expressed in terms of the Son of Man expected in the future, with whom Jesus came to identify himself⁸.

Schweitzer's recognition of the importance of eschatology in the gospel-tradition was valuable, and already Johannes Weiss had done so⁹ among others. But Schweitzer's method of using eschatology together with the theme of secrecy, in order to discover behind the gospels the plan of Jesus' life and his own developing self-consciousness is a different matter. It was Schweitzer's belief that his approach was a 'simplification of the literary problem' which enhanced the 'credibility of the Gospel tradition'¹⁰. Since the early church, according to Schweitzer, was indifferent to the life of Jesus, it did not feel compelled to "fabricate facts" in the life of Jesus'¹¹. For the church, Jesus' messiahship was grounded on the resurrection not on the earthly ministry¹². Thus the gospels could be said to contain reliable tradition without too much embroidery. Schweitzer took it for granted that Jesus must have been the one to initiate the question of his messiahship and thought it essential that he should have done so¹³. Schweitzer, however, whilst considering that an accurate picture of Jesus can be found within the gospels, saw a distinction

between his outlook and that of the church which preserved the tradition.

Wrede's approach was quite different. He may have thought it likely that Jesus' conception was different from that of the church, but went further by asserting that there was no connection between the two in that it was doubtful whether he had ever thought of himself as Messiah, and that not the historical Jesus but church dogma lay behind the structure and contents of the gospels. The attitude of Jesus himself was unknown. There was a complete break between Jesus and the church rather than just a development. The messianic secret in Mark's gospel was for Wrede a reflection of the early church's awareness of this. Nothing positive about Jesus, at least with regard to his messiahship and the pattern of his life and thought, could be ascertained from the gospel material.

This judgment was based on a radical and systematic examination, primarily of the earliest gospel, assumed to be that of Mark, as a critique of the liberal historical approach to the gospels. Wrede set out to show that the gospels reflect early church tradition rather than the outline of Jesus' life and that their setting in the life and faith

of the early church must be investigated before judgments are made from them about the historical Jesus. This possibility had been too easily dismissed by Schweitzer on inadequate grounds. He had treated the gospels as primarily clues to and sources for the life of Jesus. This procedure had meant accepting some aspects and rejecting others according to taste¹⁴ and the presumed necessity of discovering how the material could be connected as an account of Jesus' life. That it could be so connected was more a dogmatic assumption than a necessary conclusion from the material itself. It was this kind of approach which Wrede criticised, and the theme of the messianic secret seemed to him to be a justification for his view.

Wrede had his predecessors in such scholars as Bruno Bauer, Gustav Volkmar and S. Hoekstra¹⁵ and rested his work to a large extent on the by then generally accepted thesis of the priority of Mark¹⁶. Since the Marcan order lay behind that of Matthew and Luke this was of great importance for any attempt to reconstruct the life of Jesus. The liberals had recognized the lateness of the records but had not taken this with sufficient seriousness¹⁷. The only attempts made to differentiate what could be ascribed

to Jesus from what could be ascribed to the early church had been in the direction of rationalizing miracle stories and excising contradictions in and between narratives in order to produce an apparently credible account. But, asked Wrede, how could this account, when substituted for that of the evangelist, be its actual historical content or kernel, when it was not in the writer's own mind and not what he had in fact written¹⁸. There was no reason to believe that this historical kernel was there at all. The spirit of the work itself, and not psychological connections introduced on the basis of the arbitrary assumptions and presuppositions of the reader, was for Wrede the only proper criterion for judging the contents of a piece of writing, especially when the facts were so little known.

Taking a special interest in the theme of secrecy, Wrede subjected the Marcan outline to what Bousset called a 'consistent and sustained methodological' enquiry,¹⁹ which Baldensperger admitted to find wearying,²⁰ in the attempt to see whether a reasonable historical narrative, such as the liberals claimed to exist, could in fact be obtained. Wrede had no difficulty in pointing out the contradictions and inconsistencies in Mark which prevail against this. Wrede picked out passages suggesting that Jesus tried to keep his messiahship a secret throughout his earthly life, e.g.

his commands to the demons to be silent when they address him with messianic or other titles, his commands to the disciples after Peter's confession and after the transfiguration not to speak of him or of what they have heard and seen, and his general commands to secrecy after certain miracles, as well as passages where the disciples show a consistent lack of understanding of apparently clear and unambiguous events and statements, e.g. after the two feeding miracles and the prophecies of the passion. Throughout there is the implication that Jesus is the Messiah and this is necessary to make the narrative worth telling²¹ but this belongs to the literary construction of the evangelist. The messiahship provides the content of what it is forbidden to communicate and the giving of special revelation to the disciples is a necessary part of the theme of their lack of understanding. On this basis the consistent appearance of both aspects of concealment and revelation side by side in the gospel is explicable²² as well as the contradictions in the secrecy theme itself. The theme reflects the fact that historically the concept of Jesus' messiahship dates from the resurrection²³ as we see from Mk. ix. 9, and the theological hint of this at Mk. iv. 21f²⁴.

The 'confession' of Peter at Caesarea Philippi does not provide the turning-point in the narrative which many have read into it²⁵. There are clear revelations earlier²⁶

even if they are unperceived, and no development of understanding on the disciples' part leads up to Caesarea Philippi. Also there remains a considerable lack of understanding afterwards on the disciples' part. They remain throughout the gospel unable to grasp what Jesus says²⁷. It is Matthew who gives prominence to the passage. But in Mark the command to silence after Peter's so-called confession is virtually a slap in the face²⁸. References to the passion also occur earlier in the gospel, particularly at ii. 20. There is nothing to suggest that Mark regarded Caesarea Philippi as marking a point of development in his narrative, nor that it was so historically.

For Wrede it was clear that Mark knew nothing of the historical life of Jesus²⁹ though some scanty outlines may yet be visible³⁰. Mark's gospel belongs rather to the history of dogma³¹. The apparent contradictions are not historical difficulties³² but arise from the fact that the work is built around a theme which has its origin in the thinking of the early church³³ and one which is a theological conception³⁴. The only relation which history has to this is negative.

The other evangelists are dependent on Mark for the ordering of their material and modify his account in different ways³⁵. Matthew has no further understanding of

the messianic secret and in most cases completely alters it. Luke restricts it to the suffering and death of Jesus and constructs a dogmatic scheme of a history of salvation divided into two periods, Jesus' earthly life and the time following his death and resurrection. Here too the Marcan plan is disrupted, but in line with the preconceptions of the evangelist and not from independent historical knowledge. John alone can be compared with Mark, but his relation to the tradition is quite different³⁶. In John the theme of teaching in riddles is developed to cover the whole of Jesus' teaching, for the disciples as well as for others, during his life, whilst in Mark it referred to Jesus' teaching in parables (i.e. 'riddles')³⁷ that those without might not understand.

Having tried to show that the motif of secrecy is a literary and theological conception in the plan of Mark rather than a historical theme, Wrede sets out in the latter half of his book³⁸ to explain the origin of the conception. Its sole relation with history had been said to be the fact that the point of origin of belief in and proclamation of Jesus' messiahship was the resurrection. Wrede now analysed the theme and differentiated within it two elements, which are parallel but quite independent³⁹.

The first is the suggestion that Jesus kept his messiahship secret till the resurrection, the other the lack of understanding of the disciples before the resurrection (i.e. the twin themes of secrecy and of an actual secret). Neither of these two ideas could have developed out of the other nor could have demanded the other⁴⁰. Both must be seen as twin concepts arising from the consciousness of the early Christian community, parts of the development of the beliefs and understanding of the early church which we can see behind the gospels.

According to Wrede the first element in the motif of secrecy in Mark's gospel, Jesus' concealment of his messiahship either by commands to silence or by teaching in parables or in secret, has nothing to do with Jesus' self-consciousness or his understanding about the nature of his messiahship but with the church's knowledge, at a time when Jesus' life was beginning to be described in messianic terms, that awareness of his messiahship dated from the resurrection⁴¹. It had always been difficult to see, on the basis of the gospel material, how Jesus had conceived of his messiahship⁴². The relation between the concept of the coming Son of Man in the gospels and Jesus' earthly self-consciousness had always been a mystery⁴³. If Jesus had identified himself with the coming Son of Man he would have to have presupposed his death or removal, just as they are presupposed by the

church. In fact the identification represents the Christian view of Jesus' messiahship. Thus Jesus' messiahship appears in the gospels as present and concealed, yet future. It is not the case that we can see a conception by Jesus of his messiahship as proleptic⁴⁴.

The way in which Jesus' messiahship is presented in Mark is perfectly understandable, according to Wrede, if one asks how the concept of a concealed messiahship arose⁴⁵. Wrede rejected the view, which he admits to have been his first thought⁴⁶ and which is often wrongly ascribed to him⁴⁷, that the element of concealment arose from the apologetically-inspired desire of the church to explain why Jesus' messiahship only became known after his death. This was because it was not clear why this should have been necessary if it was an established fact that Jesus became Messiah at the resurrection.⁴⁸ Why should it have been necessary to discuss the question of Jesus' messiahship during his earthly life if it was clearly the case that it was only known at the resurrection? It was not clear what internal doubts or external attacks should have demanded of the church this kind of apologetic. If it was felt important to stress Jesus' foreknowledge direct statement of this was all that was necessary rather than a complex motif of secrecy. Knowledge that Jesus' messiahship

dated from the resurrection would not demand the concept of earlier concealment, and indeed the concept seems to exist side-by-side with statements that he was the Messiah. It implies a concealed and future messiahship and would seem to exclude open proclamation of his messiahship during his lifetime⁴⁹. There is not even a stress on the disciples' secret knowledge⁵⁰. Commands to silence are general. The theme does not so much stress ignorance of Jesus' messiahship during his lifetime as the positive fact that awareness of it arose from the resurrection, and not just after it⁵¹. Because of this Jesus' messiahship is represented during his lifetime as future and concealed. There is no attempt to explain anything away.

It was from this concept of concealment with regard to Jesus' messiahship in his lifetime that the idea arose that there was something to conceal. The life of Jesus began to be described in messianic terms, in a way which had begun to be evident in Mark⁵². The theme of the secret messiahship lies in fact between knowledge that the ascription to Jesus of the title Messiah took place at the resurrection and a later representation of Jesus' life in messianic terms. To put it in another way: the concept of the messianic secret arose out of the impulse to present the

life of Jesus as messianic, controlled none the less by the earlier and yet strong awareness of the facts⁵³. The development was probably from a picture of Jesus not recognised as Messiah in his lifetime to that of Jesus refusing to be so known⁵⁴. This is how the concept must have arisen and developed according to Wrede.

Likewise, the other side of the theme of secrecy in Mark, the disciples' lack of understanding, despite apparently clear and unambiguous statements, is to be explained as arising out of the knowledge that a change in the consciousness of the disciples took place at the resurrection⁵⁵. We can see a reflection of this in the Lucan and Johannine legends of the post-resurrection gift of the Spirit⁵⁶. Fundamental to the faith of the church was the change wrought in the disciples' understanding and experience by the resurrection. Thus this theme is parallel to the other one⁵⁷ and performs a similar function in the tradition.

Mark has brought these two themes together, with the resulting contradictions and inconsistencies in the narrative⁵⁸. The Marcan parable-chapter illustrates this in that secret teaching is given to the disciples and yet they remain without understanding. Also a tendency to present Jesus' life in messianic terms has begun to break up the theme of secrecy.

Peter's confession belongs to the post-resurrection situation⁵⁹ and conflicts with the theme of the disciples' lack of understanding. But in its present place the 'confession' is rejected. Here, however, Wrede was clearly in difficulties and had not come to a clear decision. He found contradictory material in Mark also in the account of the healing of Bartimaeus and the entry to Jerusalem. These, however, he took to be late developments in the tradition.

Luke, he said, had retained the future aspect of Jesus' messiahship and made use of the secret of the passion in Mark to stress the fact that Jesus' messiahship could only be proclaimed in the future after the passion and resurrection⁶⁰. Wrede also thought that Gnostic emphasis in the apocryphal gospels on secret teaching given to the disciples, especially after the resurrection, was probably to be regarded as resulting from the older theme of secrecy and the historical background to it, as well as being a later adaptation and development of it⁶¹.

Thus Wrede denied that one could extract from Mark, supplemented by Matthew and Luke, a picture of the life of Jesus. The work contains too many contradictions, demanding the use of arbitrary connections, to make sense as history or to allow such a procedure. Also the central theme of

the gospel seems to disallow the possibility. This theme of the messianic secret is derived from the consciousness of the early church and dominates the rest of the material. The concept came into being from awareness that Jesus was first held to be Messiah after and as a result of the resurrection. Thus Jesus' messiahship appears in Mark as future and concealed. It is probable then that Jesus himself did not hold himself to be or proclaim himself as the Messiah, although there can be no certainty about this and the discussion in his book was not regarded by Wrede as settling the question⁶². Mark presents us with a conflation of two themes of secrecy and a later theme of open messiahship in which we can detect behind the gospel a developing tradition and not a developing life of Jesus.

Bousset⁶³, who was later to take up a position much closer to Wrede, summed up Wrede's significance in his own time when he said that, in future, research into the life of Jesus must have a clearer awareness of its limitations, and of the boundaries and possibilities of knowledge. The psychology and individuality of each of the evangelists and the limitations of the gospel tradition as a whole must be investigated. From then on over-hasty conclusions about Jesus' life must cease.

A mediating position between Schweitzer and Wrede was taken up by Johannes Weiss. He rejected the idea that the gospels contain a chronological account - though naturally the baptism of Jesus is at the beginning and the passion at the end⁶⁴. Mark's gospel is basically 'Verkündigung' (proclamation) and not historical in character. But this does not mean that it is not closely related to earlier traditions which are connected with knowledge about Jesus' life. The earliest tradition dates Jesus' messiahship from the resurrection.⁶⁵ This reflects the fact that during Jesus' life his messiahship was conceived as future and that Peter's confession was originally that Jesus was the one destined to become the Messiah⁶⁶. Because of this the commands to silence are understandable within the framework of Jesus' life⁶⁷ though Mark has developed them in line with the Pauline idea of the 'hardening' of the people. But even the disciples appear unable to grasp the full meaning of Jesus' messiahship in his lifetime although they are given secret teaching. The disciples' lack of understanding - or misunderstanding - thus acts as a foil to the full content of the Gospel⁶⁸.

It is clear that this approach does not escape the difficulties in expounding the themes in the gospel with

regard to the life of Jesus which had been pointed out by Wrede although it may be that Wrede had been too sceptical about the possibility of doing so. A method was still required by which earlier forms of the tradition could be ascertained in relation to the gospels as we have them. But Wrede's insistence on starting with these gospels and firstly with Mark, was still right. Weiss had really fallen between two stools in his attempt to find a relation to the life of Jesus in the gospels and reach an understanding of the present structure of the gospels and was unable to do either adequately.

Of course it may still be true that both needed to be done. The question is one of method and approach, as Schweitzer noted⁶⁹. Schweitzer pointed out that one could either make sense of the gospels historically by finding the right key or one could not. If the latter was the case then Wrede's method was not just a roundabout way of refuting the liberals but a necessary procedure in itself, and the only valid one. Wrede and Weiss had been unjust to each other in the sense that eschatology may well be the key to Jesus' preaching and life but that also there was a serious question about the relation of the gospel-material to the traditions of the early church. This latter question

must be considered according to Wrede before one claimed to have found a satisfactory or possible explanation of aspects of the tradition in terms of Jesus' life. Weiss took it as an axiom that the fundamentals of the church's faith reached back into the life of Jesus⁷⁰. The resurrection could not have been in itself responsible for faith in Jesus' messiahship⁷¹. Also he said that if the early church had constructed the essentials of its faith the result would have been dogma and therefore there would have been no contradictions in the gospel account⁷². It seems right that a conflict in the tradition suggests a complex development but not in itself the authenticity of any particular aspect. Weiss contended too that the resurrection was seen in the tradition as the time when Jesus entered on his messianic status but that this depends on preparation for the idea in Jesus' lifetime. To say this would require very careful evaluation of the tradition behind its use in Mark but it is in itself a strong argument. It does not however decide the nature of the concept of messiahship in Jesus' lifetime nor the explanation of the theme of secrecy, but it is helpful.

Schweitzer returned to the discussion after Wrede in Von Reimarus zu Wrede⁷³. His description of the

approach of Wrede as that of 'radical scepticism' was criticised as inaccurate by Adolf Jülicher⁷⁴ - who described Schweitzer's work as unliterary and dogmatic - and Schweitzer himself amended this in later editions of that book. Schweitzer referred to the opinion of Bruno Bauer⁷⁵ that 'the inconsistency between the public life of Jesus and his messianic claim lies either in the nature of the Jewish messianic conception or in the representation of the Evangelist'⁷⁶. Bauer had assigned the messianic secret to the literary work of the evangelist because he rejected eschatology as a factor in the lifetime of Jesus. Wrede had however in fact assumed eschatology as a factor in Jesus' preaching in an earlier work⁷⁷ - 'Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes' vacation lecture course in Breslau 9th-11th Oc. 1895, printed in Vorträge und Studien Tübingen 1907, cf. Das Messiasgeheimnis pp. 211ff - but found in the gospel of Mark the Christian concept of Jesus' messiahship⁷⁸. The messianic secret came for Wrede from the pre-Markan tradition⁷⁹. As Schweitzer noted Wrede had not accepted Bauer's alternative⁸⁰. Schweitzer found the ascription to the tradition a very precarious hypothesis⁸¹. Wrede's method of ascribing different elements in the gospel to different traditions showed for Schweitzer the weakness of Wrede's position. But this was because Schweitzer thought

that he had found an explanation of the different elements in 'dogmatic history.' Here a fundamental difference of method was clear on Schweitzer's own showing. A greater influence on the tradition from history should perhaps be recognized than Wrede allowed for - see e.g. the question of Jesus' crucifixion as messianic pretender,⁸² but this would not in itself be grounds for rejecting Wrede's method of procedure.

Schweitzer also argued that the contemporary concept of messiahship in Jesus' days was of an eschatological and glorified Messiah and that this would fit the eschatological aspects of Jesus' preaching. Wrede had however recognized the place of the eschatological in Jesus' preaching in 'Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes' and had rejected the notion of Jesus' messianic self-consciousness precisely because the Messiah was a future and eschatological conception and must therefore have been part of Jesus' future expectation rather than present consciousness⁸³. How the title Messiah came to be applied to Jesus at all still remains a problem however and this is not explained by the resurrection⁸⁴. That Schweitzer had adequately explained it in terms of Jesus' self-consciousness, together with the theme of secrecy, is also doubtful. More analysis of the tradition behind the

gospels would need to be done.

The status and nature of the gospels themselves would need investigation. Wrede had not explained their purpose. Schweitzer thought them fairly direct witnesses to Jesus on the ground that the early church was not interested in Jesus' earthly life nor the question of the place of the Messiahship within it⁸⁵ and therefore did not have to 'fabricate facts'. The assumption for this was that the early church was too preoccupied with eschatology and Jesus' parousia. But the actual existence of the gospels needs explanation on this ground as well as the preservation of the tradition. Wrede himself had assumed a lack of concern as well as awareness that Jesus' life was unmessianic in the early church, reflected in the theme of secrecy where awareness that he was not Messiah in his lifetime is linked with a conviction that he is Messiah and a wish to present him as Messiah none the less. We must investigate what we find in the gospels and evaluate it without making premature assumptions about it.

There was some similarity between the two books of Wrede and Schweitzer over against the liberals, as the latter noted. Psychologizing connections and arbitrary reconstructions are avoided by both. Both take seriously

the gospels as they stand without looking for a historical kernel in the narratives. Both admit the difficulties and inconsistencies which are only explicable from the presence of a dogmatic element. For Schweitzer, however, this belongs to history, for Wrede it is an intrusion from the tradition. But Schweitzer did not really take the challenge of Wrede's work seriously enough and did not recognize it as one which affected his work as well as that of the liberals. At the same time Wrede may have been too negative about the possibility of the influence of history in the gospels as they stand and in the tradition behind them. But there is no doubt that his analysis of the theme of secrecy was of great importance.

As regards method the choice between Wrede and Schweitzer is significant in later work. Whilst Wrede has been more influential in Germany, Schweitzer has been more influential in England. Many editions of his work have appeared in English, though none of Wrede's. We note in England the example of William Sanday⁸⁶. Sanday's discussion of Wrede is inadequate⁸⁷. On Schweitzer he quotes a long passage⁸⁸ for Schweitzer's view, which is in fact Wrede's used by Schweitzer to support himself. There is no awareness of the issues and one doubts whether Sanday, like many since,

had read Wrede. This is the more serious as he is probably responsible for the subsequent neglect of Wrede in England⁸⁹.

We can see the influence of Schweitzer as early as George Tyrrell⁹⁰. He speaks of the messianic secret as betrayed by Judas⁹¹ and emphasises the place of eschatology, apocalyptic and the figure of the Son of Man in the gospel tradition⁹². Schweitzer however is not mentioned.

Rawlinson's discussion of Wrede⁹³ is typical of later English attitudes and largely the source of them, though it seems that it is itself derived in essence from Sanday. Rawlinson posits a mixture of historical fact and literary elaboration to account for the various aspects of secrecy in Mark. He contests, with Weiss, that the resurrection could be the source in itself for the conclusion that Jesus was the Messiah. This is valid but does not necessitate the view that Jesus had himself suggested it. It does, however, demand further examination of the tradition and the theme of secrecy as a whole. He also admits that the resurrection may well have wrought a change in the disciples. But this dividing up of the theme of secrecy according to historical probability is not the way to deal with Wrede's demand for a systematic and methodical investigation of the material and themes in the gospels, and particularly Mark, as they stand

and of their derivation from earlier tradition. If the structure of Mark rests on early church dogma or tradition and not directly on history then Wrede's challenge cannot be denied, even if his explanation is not satisfactory in some details. Rawlinson's argument rests too much on what is historically probable. This is not adequate on its own as a method of judging the gospel material. Wrede insisted that the secrecy-theme must be investigated as a whole, though it was divisible into different aspects, because it bears a single witness to uncertainty about the historical status of the idea that Jesus was the Messiah in his lifetime. The roots of this uncertainty need investigation through the whole Marcan tradition. It is not enough to posit that they lie in a different view of messiahship on Jesus' part from that of his contemporaries with the result that secrecy was necessary to avoid misunderstanding. As Wrede had shown this explanation would not account for all aspects of the theme of secrecy in Mark, e.g. the disciples' lack of understanding, and is not satisfactory as an explanation of the theme of messiahship in the plan of Mark as a whole. The different lines of tradition require closer analysis and more satisfactory differentiation and explanation if one is to reject Wrede's position. The argument that Jesus' view of his messiahship was different from the usual view and

therefore required secrecy is interesting but is an importation without warrant in Mark. It might be asked why secrecy should be necessary when clear exposition would have done. Also if it is claimed that this secrecy was to avoid trouble with the authorities this is difficult to maintain when in fact, according to the text as it stands, Jesus expected death from the authorities and was in fact crucified as a messianic pretender: something Wrede does not take into account. If this latter fate was part of Jesus' understanding of his historical messiahship the disciples certainly did not understand it. The attempt to explain the gospel on an historical level alone is unsatisfactory, as Wrede had shown. If this is recognized it is a necessity to investigate the gospel material in relation to previous tradition, including the theme of secrecy. Rawlinson admits that there is difficulty in Mark about the question of Jesus' messiahship and this difficulty must be rooted in the facts of history. It is also a difficulty which is highlighted by the theme of secrecy. The implications of this must be investigated in the structure of Mark and the underlying tradition. Even Rawlinson does not escape the fact that Jesus was not the generally expected Messiah and that only at the resurrection did the disciples realize what

kind of Messiah he was. The question at issue is the precise relation of the commands to silence to these aspects of the Marcan tradition, whether in history, in the tradition, or in the redactional work of the evangelist. To determine this will require careful analysis of the gospel itself.

Important to the discussion so far is the place of the Son of Man in the tradition and the relation of the concept to Jesus. The concept was crucial to Schweitzer's interpretation of secrecy in the gospels and led him to write his thesis for a Doctorate of Medicine on Jesus' mental health⁹⁴, in which he claimed that the common apocalyptic conceptions of his time saved Jesus' sanity. But, of course, it was not common at the time to see oneself as the coming Son of Man! Johannes Weiss had asserted that Jesus held himself to be the destined Messiah in the shape of the coming Son of Man. Daniel Völter⁹⁵ held that Jesus saw himself as Messiah but expected another Son of Man. Max Maurenbrecher⁹⁶ followed Wrede in the view that Jesus did not believe himself to be the Messiah and only became Messiah at the resurrection, but contended that Jesus in fact preached another Messiah in terms of the coming Son of Man. The use of the Son of Man myths was therefore the basis of Christianity⁹⁷. Hans Windisch, discussing this

view⁹⁸, agrees with it and says⁹⁹ that in future whoever holds the messianic consciousness of Jesus and is opposed to the views of Daniel Völter must either ascribe all the Son of Man sayings to the early church or explain Jesus' self-consciousness along psychologizing lines like Johannes Weiss. Thus, given the difficulties of Völter's position¹⁰⁰, the alternatives for the upholders of Jesus' messianic self-consciousness are, either a messianic self-consciousness of Jesus without the concept of the Son of Man - the nature of which would be difficult to envisage - or a psychologizing approach open to criticism on grounds of method. The latter would require also that Jesus took his death for granted. But, according to Maurenbrecher and Windisch, Jesus' preaching of the coming Son of Man need not have involved any messianic self-consciousness on his part. Jesus as the coming Son of Man was the conception of the early church. The eschatological view of Jesus' preaching had thus its own difficulties for the contenders for Jesus' messianic self-consciousness and his being viewed as Messiah in his lifetime. The early church's view of his messiahship was still a future one which depended on his previous death. This whole question assumes importance again later and itself demands careful analysis of the gospel tradition.

Wilhelm Bousset¹⁰¹ moved much nearer Wrede than in his original review. The Son of Man concept, applied

to Jesus, belonged to the theology and dogma of the early church¹⁰². The messianic secret was an apologetic device¹⁰³ to explain the unmessianic character of Jesus' life and its tragic outcome¹⁰⁴ and was a dogma of the evangelist himself. Bousset's earlier position¹⁰⁵ had been like that of Johannes Weiss. Rudolf Bultmann rightly pointed out¹⁰⁶ that the view that the messianic secret in Mark has an apologetic purpose does not fit the juxtaposition of concealment and revelation in the gospel which Wrede had pointed out and does not explain either the disobedience of the commands to be silent nor the disciples' lack of understanding.

Form-criticism, which attempted to systematize the approach of Wrede¹⁰⁷ and Wellhausen to the gospels¹⁰⁸, attempted a more careful analysis of the relation between tradition and gospel-redaction. In the improved form of his work on the subject, Martin Dibelius¹⁰⁹ saw the messianic secret as a literary dogma of the evangelist which attempted to explain how the revelation in Jesus as Messiah fitted with his fate on the cross. Thus Mark's gospel was the book of secret epiphanies¹¹⁰. The passion was the main interest of Mark and the other traditions were used to explain

Jesus' life under the shadow of the cross which brought that life to an end. The gospels were in fact passion-stories with an extended introduction as stated by Martin Kähler¹¹¹. This harked back to the words of Johannes Weiss that for Mark - as for Paul - Jesus' death was the sole point and purpose of his life. Mark's gospel was thus a passion story extended backwards¹¹². Dibelius' view of the messianic secret involves a part-theological, part-historical apologetical interpretation of it as a literary theory of the evangelist necessitated by the compilation of oral tradition in an account of the pre-passion life of Jesus the Messiah.

Rudolf Bultmann went further than Dibelius into the historical implications of form-criticism for the tradition as well as its implications for the redaction of the gospels. Thus for Bultmann the messianic secret was not just a literary phenomenon but the actually necessary expression of faith in a Messiah for whom an incognito was characteristic¹¹³. The dogma of the messianic secret allowed the evangelist to write a life of Jesus as the Messiah¹¹⁴. Wrede's interpretation of it and of its implications are fully accepted¹¹⁵. Dibelius' characterization of Mark as the book

of secret epiphanies is correct. Mark has joined the Hellenistic kerygma about Christ with the tradition of the story of Jesus. The theme of secrecy is the work of the evangelist and necessitated by this procedure¹¹⁶. It reflected the unmessianic character of Jesus' life, judged by traditional interpretations, and an interpretation of Jesus as the Messiah by the church which involved a quite new understanding of messiahship taking account both of the passion and the Son of Man expectation of Jesus. This reinterpretation of the concept could not have been the work of Jesus himself. The secrecy theme results in contradictions in the gospel between concealment and revelation understandable only from this view of its background in the editorial work of Mark. The fact that it is located in editorial sentences and not in the traditional material shows that it is a theory of the evangelist and not a historical fact (as against the view of Schniewind)¹¹⁷. To be historical it would require that Jesus identified himself with the coming Son of Man when the application of that title to the earthly Jesus would itself require a good deal of reinterpretation. This was evident for Bultmann in the secondary Son of Man sayings in the gospels which refer to the earthly or the crucified Jesus when compared with the

authentic Son of Man sayings which merely refer to a coming apocalyptic figure separate from Jesus himself. For Bultmann the identification of Jesus with the Son of Man reflected in some groups of sayings was the work of the early Hellenistic church. Mark was conscious of what he was doing as is reflected in his alteration of traditions reflecting the resurrection faith by the addition of the note of secrecy¹¹⁸. The 'confession' at Caesarea Philippi is certainly not the turningpoint of the Marcan narrative which many had seen in it, either from history or in the Marcan redaction¹¹⁹. Jesus' own preaching belongs only to the prolegomena of New Testament theology¹²⁰. In any case faith in Jesus as Messiah is, for us as for the early church, independent of historical facts, and exists as response to the church's kerygma¹²¹. The fourth gospel developed the Marcan theme in that, whilst for Mark the messiahship of Jesus was a secret because it was concealed, for John it was a secret because it was revealed¹²².

In contrast to the work of Bultmann is that of Rudolf Otto¹²³ which revived the approach of Johannes Weiss and Albert Schweitzer by interpreting the gospel material as it stands to create a consistent and credible account of Jesus' eschatological preaching and self-consciousness as the designated Messiah-Son of Man in such a way as to create

a single conception. The work of Julius Schniewind stands out against that of Bultmann as an attempt to take a look at the messianic secret in the gospels from a different point of view. Literary analysis is ignored in preference for a view of the gospels as revelatory history, a process which did not differentiate the supernatural from the historical.¹²⁴ The conception that the messianic secret is the expression of Jesus' eschatological preaching is taken from Schweitzer whilst Schweitzer's interpretation of Jesus' ethics as 'Interimsethik' is rejected on the grounds that Schweitzer did not give full validity to his eschatological understanding of the messianic secret.¹²⁵ Bultmann had, in fact, according to Schniewind, lead us further unintentionally by his description of Jesus' preaching as eschatological and as comprising a call to salvation and repentance in itself equivalent to a present demand on the hearer of the time of salvation itself. Judgment was involved in one's response to Jesus' words. And the decisive message of Jesus' preaching was forgiveness.¹²⁶ Bultmann could therefore use the expression 'implicitly messianic' for Jesus' message.¹²⁷ Jesus' messiahship is perceived in response to that message and not in neutral investigation. For Schniewind, then, Jesus' call to repentance linked with the call to salvation was itself the messianic secret¹²⁸. The implied presence of the

kingdom of God signified that secret¹²⁹ because Jesus was the kingdom of God in person¹³⁰. The Marcan parable-chapter did not contain the apologetic theory of the church¹³¹ because the secret of the parables concealed a secret of the kingdom of God present in Jesus' person. The use of the title Son of Man served to maintain this secret as a means of a simultaneous veiling and unveiling of himself by Jesus¹³². The passion was also a continuation of the same secret. The resurrection meant revealed messiahship. The gospels were written from faith in this resurrection, but the secret was maintained in the preaching of the Gospel¹³³.

But the Gospel in the gospels was clearly, for Schniewind, rooted in history. This was for Schniewind the explanation of the fact that Mark's gospel¹³⁴ was permeated with the conception of the messianic secret. But it might be argued that the question about the relation of the Gospel in the gospels, both to history and the tradition, was the one that ought to be asked here, whereas Schniewind seems to ignore the question about the incidence of the messianic secret in Mark and explains it from a dogmatic view of revelatory history. Bultmann was right to insist, against Schniewind, that it is the incidence of the messianic secret in Mark which is precisely the problem requiring explanation over against the tradition and the history, since its place in the earlier tradition, apart from Mark and hence its place

in history, is in doubt. This is the case even if it were argued that the secrecy theme is a proper interpretation of the history in relation to the Gospel. The question of the messianic secret as a valid theological interpretation of history and Jesus' preaching, and as a historical factor in Jesus' life, the motivation and inner meaning of his life and preaching, are two different things. Schniewind's approach to the gospels results in a failure to distinguish them. This is because he wishes to assert the truth of the Gospel behind the history. But the result seems to be that he wants to see it in the history as well. Thus Schniewind says that Jesus was crucified because he would be Messiah,¹³⁵ typically telescoping history and Gospel, historical and theological judgements. He explains the reticence of Jesus about his messiahship from a self-consciousness which nullified the mere concern with a particular title.¹³⁶ His insistence that Mark is not concerned with history as such¹³⁷ shows that he must admit that there is a problem about history but that he wants to see it as part of the history itself. When Bultmann says that Jesus' preaching implies messiahship or speaks of an implicit Christology¹³⁸ he denies that this involves any messianic self-consciousness on Jesus' part. It is rather that Jesus' messiahship is perceived by the

church in its full response to his message and his person. Thus the relation in the gospels between the tradition about Jesus and his eschatological preaching, and the church's christology, needs investigating in terms of the church's conscious response to Jesus' message in christological terms. Then it may be found that the place of the messianic secret is in the evangelist's exposition of the relation between history and Gospel, Jesus' eschatology and the church's christology, rather than in the history itself or in Jesus' eschatological preaching itself. Thus Jesus' call to decision 'does imply a christology which will unfold the implications of the positive answer to his demand for the decision, the obedient response which acknowledges God's revelation in Jesus', not Jesus' messianic self-consciousness. 'Such christology became explicit in the earliest Church to the extent that they understood Jesus as the one whom God by the resurrection has made Messiah, and that they awaited him as the coming Son of Man.'¹³⁹ The messianic secret can be said to witness to this, but not, as Schniewind would have it, be used as a defence by an apologist like Schniewind himself for the messianic self-consciousness of Jesus, and for Jesus' description of himself as Son of Man.

A doctorate thesis¹⁴⁰ by Hans Jürgen Ebeling emphasized further the work of the evangelist. For Ebeling the aim and most characteristic feature of the Marcan gospel was the open proclamation and revelation of the messiahship of Jesus.¹⁴¹ The secrecy-motif is the construction of the evangelist and is to be understood from his conception of his work as a proclamation of the Gospel. The theme, in each of its aspects - commands to silence, the lack of understanding of the disciples, and the Marcan parable-theory is a single conception of Mark. Wrede had differentiated two aspects within it belonging to the pre-Markan tradition and the consciousness of the church, in forming its traditions, of the unmessianic character of Jesus' life. Because of form-criticism it was possible to differentiate better between earlier tradition and the work of the evangelist. The messianic secret could then be seen as the result of the preaching of the risen one and of the resurrection-certainty of the church set in the light of the cross.¹⁴² In the gospel the story of Jesus was read back from the cross in the light of the resurrection. There is no consciousness of incongruity, and no distinction is made or implied by Mark between the real life of Jesus and the preaching of Jesus as the Christ¹⁴³. The messianic secret is to be understood from the proclamation of revelation

and not vice-versa.¹⁴⁴ There never was a purely historical account of Jesus,¹⁴⁵ nor any interest in one.¹⁴⁶

Thus the commands to silence in the miracle-stories are seen as foils to highlight the fame of Jesus which is spread abroad¹⁴⁷ and the disciples' lack of understanding illustrates the revelatory character of Jesus' message and the obedience demanded by God's Messiah, the transcendent Lord.¹⁴⁸

The parable-theory illustrates the demand made on the hearer by the message of the preaching of Jesus in the Gospel, i.e. by the revelation of the Christ. Questions of authenticity are in fact irrelevant, according to Ebeling, beyond the warning 'take heed what you hear'.¹⁴⁹ The point of the gospel is that it is the resurrection-certainty of the church which uncovers the messianic secret. It is in this way that the commands to Peter to be silent after his confession and to the disciples after the transfiguration 'till the resurrection' are to be understood.¹⁵⁰ There is no consciousness of a non-messianic life of Jesus nor any trace of a historical understanding of the secret.¹⁵¹ The resurrection is seen as the only guarantee of Jesus' messiahship and it is as such central to the secrecy theme. Belief in Jesus' messiahship did not arise at the resurrection as a result of reflection back on Jesus' words and a process

of deduction. The risen Lord proclaimed his messiahship himself.¹⁵²

Thus for Ebeling the fact that Jesus' messiahship was a post-resurrection conception was quite natural and needed no explanation. The gospel narratives were not to be understood from a historical point of view, whether negatively or positively, nor was Mark's gospel to be seen as constructed with reference to history or as a historicizing presentation of the Gospel. The only approach to the life of Jesus was, for Ebeling, by way of the Gospel. The messianic secret stressed the revelatory character of this Gospel and its dependence on the resurrection, as well as its demand for the response of faith. History could not be appealed to as an independent witness, and indeed was for Ebeling entirely subservient to the revelation of the risen Lord and incapable of contradicting it.

This approach seems, rightly, to stress Mark's gospel as a presentation of the primitive kerygma and its relation to the positive preaching of the Gospel. The work is not concerned to 'fabricate facts' nor to make an historically orientated apology for the Gospel. It is right to see the gospel as the redactional work of the evangelist and the messianic secret as an important part of that redaction. But at the same time Ebeling seems to ignore the real question about the actual relation in the literary gospel between

history and the Gospel in its presentation of the church's kerygma and tradition. The fact that Mark was consciously ordering that tradition in the form of a life of Jesus would suggest that the messianic secret, as indeed belonging to the redactional work of the evangelist, had some function to perform in respect of the evangelist's understanding of the relation between history and the Gospel. There is in Mark not only proclamation but also a narrative, and it seems likely, since the theme of the messianic secret seems to stand between them as an intrusion of the evangelist, that that theme is the means of relating and differentiating them. It may well be that Mark is not concerned with history as such, and that he sees no real clash between history and the Gospel, but, at the same time, he shows awareness of a discrepancy which requires explanation and an account of the proper relation and differentiation between them. Both in its form and content his whole work can be regarded as concerned with that relation and differentiation and the theme of the messianic secret should probably be regarded as a means of presenting them. In Ebeling's understanding of it the messianic secret seems to have no real function at all in the construction of the gospel out of the tradition but appears only as a means of highlighting the Gospel-message which the evangelist wished to convey. This seems

to be because Ebeling neglected the real questions about the literary construction of the gospel which are fundamental in Mark to the question of the structure of the Gospel itself, because the evangelist seems to have constructed his work in the form of a life of Jesus out of the kerygmatic tradition precisely to show that structure. The structure of the Gospel of Jesus Christ cannot after all ignore the relation of its message to history, however that relation is conceived. If there is no problem here, as Ebeling contends, that must be demonstrated. Since Ebeling ignores the relation between history and the Gospel he fails to deal adequately with the construction of the Marcan gospel and hence with the messianic secret.

At the same time it might well turn out from a purely theological point of view and from the standpoint of contemporary exegesis of Mark that Ebeling has some truth in what he says. Mark probably does emphasize the Gospel over against and in preference to history and assert that history cannot properly be said to contradict the Gospel, whilst being unable to offer independent proof of it. But this needs reinforcing from a study of the way Mark has consciously ordered his material to this end and from the background to the gospel in history and the tradition. The function of the secrecy-theme can then be properly assessed.

Here two different tasks of exegesis, the literary and historical, and the theological, are to be distinguished. Ebeling seems to have attempted the latter without proper reference to the former. There is however a hint of a valuable development in the understanding of the theological structure of Mark with regard to history and the Gospel, but it is weak by reason of the failure to take the relation to history in the gospel seriously.

Ernst Loymeyer was rightly critical of Ebeling because of a failure to get behind the presentation of the evangelist in his discussion of the contents of the gospel of Mark.¹⁵³ For Loymeyer the different motifs in the gospels belonged to different church traditions. They represented different christological interpretations of Jesus' life. Lohmeyer's work was left incomplete, but the main lines of his approach are clear. Three conceptions are seen to be united in the gospel picture; that of the Son of Man, that of the servant of the Lord, and that of the divine, yet concealed, Son.¹⁵⁴ Thus the whole of Jesus' life is seen as lying under a veil, a secrecy proper to the servant of God, the eschatological fulfiller,¹⁵⁵ and to the earthly activity of the Son of Man.¹⁵⁶ The secret presence of the Son of Man is reflected in the commands to silence.¹⁵⁷ The secret was resolved at the

resurrection.¹⁵⁸ The secrecy-theme would seem to be an intrinsic part of the Gospel and the history, and essential to any picture of the historical Jesus. It is seen as lying behind the presentation of the evangelist in the traditions which he uses.¹⁵⁹ The idea that complete traditions of Jesus' life reflected in the different christological titles and associated with different geographical locations in which the concealment theme can be traced back can only be investigated by detailed exegesis of the text.¹⁶⁰

New developments since the war regarding the question of the historical Jesus in the gospels took place in the work of some of Bultmann's old pupils. It was felt that it ought to be possible to posit some actual correspondence between the historical Jesus and statements of faith in the gospels, whilst it was still recognized that the resurrection was central to faith in Jesus and that no reliance could be placed on history as such. The nature and character of Jesus' life were seen to be as relevant as the mere fact of his existence in history. It was still recognized however that the gospels were not accounts of Jesus' life and that they were based on the kerygma of the church, but that the relevance of the historical Jesus was implied throughout. Messianic self-consciousness was not, however, ascribed to the historical Jesus, although the historical tradition

contained an 'indirect christology'.¹⁶¹ The old liberal school's attempts to free the picture of Jesus in the gospels from church dogma and find the historical Jesus was seen to be misguided,¹⁶² not because the historical Jesus was all but irrelevant, as he was for Bultmann, but because the historical Jesus was presupposed in the church's proclamation of him. He did not proclaim himself as Messiah but the church's proclamation of him as Messiah fitted the implications of his own preaching.¹⁶³ The messianic secret in Mark reflects the indirectness of any application to the historical Jesus of the title Messiah, or any other such title, yet it does not deny their appositiveness when applied to him from beyond the resurrection. It reflects not so much the unmessianic character of Jesus' life as a 'movement of broken Messianic hopes' finding their fulfillment in relation to Jesus at the resurrection.¹⁶⁴ But it is a device of the evangelist in the compilation of his gospel to take account of this background.

Hans Conzelmann sees the gospels as an entirely new kind of literature created by the taking over of previously oral material which was used in the form of a narrative about Jesus' life. The first example of this is the gospel of Mark which is a consciously compiled narrative account of the kerygma built around two geographical "Blöcke"-

Galilee and Jerusalem - and the theme of the messianic secret. The varied material of the synoptic tradition is united consciously around this theme by "Mark" in a unity which was latent from the beginning around the person of Jesus, but made explicit in the present arrangement of the material in literary form.¹⁶⁵

According to Conzelmann, Wrede and Bultmann had thought of two things co-existing prior to Mark: faith in Christ and traditional material in which the earthly life of Jesus was not yet presented in messianic terms. These were adjusted to each other by means of the "theory" of the messianic secret: that the fact that Jesus was the Messiah had been concealed during his lifetime. Against this Conzelmann argued that form-criticism showed that the pre-Markan tradition was already messianic and Mark showed no knowledge of any other kind of tradition. What we can differentiate, through an investigation of the tradition, as earlier unmessianic material and messianic material created by the church, was homogeneous for Mark. Mark took over the messianic tradition and presented it as part of the kerygma of the church and as the expression of a specific understanding of revelation, not with a pragmatic historical interest. This is the case with Mk. iv. 10-12. It was not unmessianic but messianic material which gave

Mark anxiety. Wrede's explanation of the messianic secret does not account for the kind of literature we call 'gospel'. Mark has not made use of a "theory" to explain a difficulty in his material, but has introduced a theological conception to unite material, disparate in form, in a single view-point. The secrecy theme should then be seen as the hermeneutical presupposition of the literary type called 'gospel'.

Mark's scheme was to describe an intended secret and a necessary lack of understanding before the resurrection.¹⁶⁶ The disciples in the gospel could not understand before the resurrection, not just did not understand, because their hearts were hardened. The manner of presentation of this scheme is governed by the requirements of the dialectic involved in the reference back to the situation of Jesus' life. The possibility of faith is thus seen to depend on the resurrection. By means of the theme of secrecy, however, Mark demonstrates the continuity between the time of Jesus' life and after the resurrection, a continuity based on an understanding of revelation, present in the former time but perceived in the latter. Mark is concerned with the distinction between what is visible on earth during Jesus' lifetime and now, in the time of the church. In a similar way Mark juxtaposes history and apocalyptic in ch. xiii.

Thus Conzelmann interprets the messianic secret as a part of the redactional work of Mark and his theological understanding of the relation between the Gospel and the life of Jesus in the kerygma of the church and the tradition upon which he drew. Mark had no historical understanding of the Gospel and yet saw a real relation between the church's Gospel and the life of Jesus. The theme of the messianic secret took account of both these aspects of Mark's understanding and enabled him faithfully to interpret and relate the Gospel and the historical tradition through an ordering of the material in the form of a life of Jesus. Thus the nature of Mark's gospel becomes clear. The approach, by taking account of the background to the gospel, is an improvement of the interpretation of Ebeling as well as of that of Bultmann and Wrede. A real assessment of the work of Mark, as well as of the early tradition and church kerygma, and of the relation in each between history and the Gospel, becomes possible by reflection on the theme of the messianic secret.

The study of the redactional work of the evangelists, complementing that of form-criticism, has helped to improve on the approach to the gospels of Wrede. The relation between earlier tradition and the work of the evangelist and between the Sitz-im-Leben of the gospel material in

the early church and in the gospels themselves becomes clearer. The gospels are recognized as being part of the early history of dogma and to depend on church tradition rather than history. But Wrede's understanding of what was involved has been refined, as is the case with Bultmann's understanding of the relation between history and the Gospel. Crucial for this change is the interpretation of the messianic secret in Mark. It is shown as not merely reflecting a discontinuity between history and the Gospel, the unmessianic character of Jesus' life, but as pointing to the positive relation between history and the Gospel in the revelation to the church of Jesus' messiahship at the resurrection.

An example of this change in the exegesis of Mark is the discussion of Mk. iv by Willi Marxsen.¹⁶⁷ Earlier interpretations had seen the 'parable-theory' as an addition of Mark,¹⁶⁸ which misunderstood the meaning of the word 'parable',¹⁶⁹ and which had either an apologetic function (so Jülicher) or was part of the evangelist's "theory" of the messianic secret (so Wrede). For Marxsen the whole of Chapter iv was the construction of the evangelist out of probably authentic items of tradition, which were used in the church's preaching. This context is what is reflected in V, V. 11, 12. No historical "theory" is involved. The

The evangelist is not concerned with history but with kerygma of the church. The messianic secret is involved in the present preaching of the church,¹⁷⁰ between the life of Jesus and the parousia.

This approach is important in its stress on the nature of the gospels as expounding the kerygmatic tradition of the church. But it should also be stressed that the form of the gospels involves reflection back on Jesus' life, and that their christological concern includes reference to the historical Jesus. Awareness of the context of the kerygma in the post-resurrection church and the proper differentiation between history and Gospel necessitated, in the earliest gospel, the theme of the messianic secret. This theme was however a positive, kerygmatically-orientated expression of the basis of the Gospel, rather than a negative, historically-orientated theory. The presentation of the church kerygma in the form of a life of Jesus necessitated the theme. This is the valuable contribution to the discussion of Hans Conzelmann. This approach differs from those of Bultmann and Ebeling in that it takes seriously the form of the gospel, and, therefore, recognizes a real interest in the historical Jesus, but, at the same time, stresses the real nature of the relationship between the Gospel and the historical Jesus. It recognizes the

implications of the messianic secret as propounded by Wrede, but improves on his explanation of it and his understanding of the structure of the gospel and its relation to earlier tradition, and, therefore, improves on his understanding of the function of the theme of secrecy in the construction of the gospel by the evangelist. The approach thus continues and improves upon previous exegesis and criticism.

There have been other attempts to interpret the theme of secrecy as belonging to the context of Jesus' earthly life and, as such, reflected in the gospels. These have been most notable in Sweden. A mediating position appeared first in the work of Ernst Percy.¹⁷¹ The messianic secret reflected for Percy the change wrought on the conception of Jesus' messiahship by the cross and resurrection. It was not a device on Jesus' part to protect him from false views of messiahship since simple rejection of the false views would be enough.¹⁷² Only Wrede¹⁷³ and Bultmann had noted the difficulties of identifying the earthly Jesus with the coming Son of Man. But the identification presented no problems after the resurrection. Then the earthly Jesus could be seen as the concealed Son of Man. Thus the Son of Man sayings reflect the change in the conception between the time of the life of Jesus and the time following his death and resurrection. Thus, clearly, for Percy there was

a basic messianic self-consciousness in Jesus' lifetime, which, in terms of Jesus' lifetime, is seen as necessarily enigmatic. This messiahship is both understood and its enigmatic quality explained after the resurrection. This approach does seem, however, to raise many questions about the history of the concept of Jesus' messiahship as revealed in the gospel material and does not explain how Jesus could have thought of himself as the Messiah or given that impression. If there was a basis for the conception in Jesus' lifetime it could not have been in his messianic self-consciousness. We do discern behind the gospels a conviction that Jesus was the Messiah, but one based on the resurrection and not on Jesus' earthly life. There is a clear difficulty in the gospels about describing Jesus on earth and in history as the Messiah, even though the idea may have appeared during his lifetime. If we treat the Son of Man material as belonging to the understanding of the post-resurrection church we have no means of understanding a messianic self-consciousness of Jesus. That remains a difficulty without any solution. The gospels give no hint as to how he might have conceived of his messiahship beyond the Son of Man sayings, which reflect, as descriptions of Jesus, the presupposition of the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus. Jesus on earth

could not be described as Son of Man either, unless it was assumed that he would fulfil the usual role of the Son of Man in heavenly glory, and this depended on his death or removal. It might be said that he presupposed his death and that this was necessary to his understanding of his messiahship, although his death seemed to contradict his being Messiah whilst being also the result of a supposed claim to be Messiah! But these solutions appear in Mark as a completely unperceived secret during Jesus' earthly life and as a contradiction of the idea of messiahship when applied to Jesus. The earthly and historical Jesus seems to be both identified with the Son of Man, without this being noted at the time, and in contradiction of his messiahship¹⁷⁴, and differentiated from him¹⁷⁵. It would seem that Percy is right to see the understanding of the post-resurrection church in the Son of Man sayings, but it would seem equally true that this leaves us without a valid ascription of messiahship to Jesus during his lifetime and without any hint of a messianic self-consciousness of Jesus. The Son of Man sayings are thus shown to be crucial to this question, as Schweitzer had already perceived.

An attempt to understand the concept of secrecy in terms of Jesus' life and to use the Son of Man sayings for this purpose was made by Erik Sjöberg¹⁷⁶. He asserted

that there were both themes of concealment and revelation throughout the gospel material and indeed throughout the New Testament¹⁷⁷. There was also, according to Sjöberg, both concealment and revelation in the apocalyptic conception of the Son of Man and in the rabbinic conception of a concealed, and possibly of a suffering, Messiah. But the Christian conception in its uniting of these other two cannot be traced in earlier material¹⁷⁸.

Sjöberg goes on to find secrecy to be a concept running through the whole of Mark's gospel¹⁷⁹. Side by side with this is clear messianic material¹⁸⁰. The question is then what meaning the concept has for Mark. Sjöberg rejects the view of Wrede that it has the function of joining together contradictions in the tradition¹⁸¹ or the view that it is suitable as an apologetic device¹⁸². He asserts, against Ebeling, that it is not a purely literary creation but has a real relation to history. The conception is explicable, according to Sjöberg, in relation to the theme of revelation and concealment in the New Testament as a whole¹⁸³ and from Jewish apocalyptic together with the fact of Jesus' earthly existence as the necessarily concealed Son of Man. The revelation of redemption was in fact made through the cross and resurrection¹⁸⁴. Mark made the secret explicit (e.g. in iv 11, 12) or sharpened it. Matthew and Luke

softened it and took it over without understanding it ¹⁸⁵. But the secret runs through all the gospel material and is to be found in the common source of Matthew and Luke. It is messianic in character, and is not a theory but a fact ¹⁸⁶.

Thus in Jesus' lifetime the messiahship was explained in terms of the Son of Man, thought of, in Jesus' understanding of himself, as concealed on earth before coming in glory ¹⁸⁷. The concept of concealment was a necessary part of Jesus' self-consciousness whilst on earth. Its presentation by Mark may be unhistorical but the fact of the secret is not. Jesus used the title Son of Man of himself, but never directly of himself on earth - thus the earthly Son of Man sayings are held to be unauthentic. Concealment belonged essentially to the historical picture of Jesus as the Messiah in terms of the concealed Son of Man. Both secrecy and the messiahship are thus seen to belong to the context of Jesus' earthly life.

The weakness of Sjöberg's position would seem to lie in his insistence on the actual and necessary concealment which makes it possible to think of Jesus on earth as Son of Man and as describing himself as Son of Man, and in the consequent reading back of the conception, as it actually appears in the gospels, schematically into the context of Jesus' earthly life. Whereas, in fact, reflection back on

to Jesus' life as already complete, from the view-point of the faith of the early church, seems necessary not only to understand the revelation of Jesus as Son of Man at the resurrection, but also to perceive the concealment involved in his earthly life. The construction of the whole conception of Jesus as the Son of Man seems to depend on Jesus' previous death in order to be the answer to the problem of his life. Also Sjöberg's position is weak in its analysis of the Son of Man material, which is not uniform and does not seem to allow for a single schematic picture of Jesus as the on earth concealed and later to be revealed Son of Man. Rather we have quite different and separate strands of tradition, some of which distinguish Jesus from the Son of Man and speak of the coming Son of Man in glory, and some of which seem to identify Jesus with the Son of Man on earth. There is no conception of concealment, unless it consists in that very identification, and no single conception of Jesus as the Son of Man running through each set of material, except in the uniting of the different strands in the gospels themselves. In fact the conception of the concealment of the Son of Man is absent from the material itself ¹⁸⁸. The messianic secret as it appears in Mark is a different and later conception of the evangelist

and is set over against the messianic tradition. It does not seem to be connected with the Son of Man tradition at all, although the conception of Jesus as the Son of Man appears to be set over against the notion of Jesus' historical messiahship. But Jesus in his lifetime can only have differentiated between himself and the Son of Man. The conception when applied to Jesus must suggest secrecy and concealment and it is clear that set against the facts of Jesus' life we can assert a concealment, but this is a later conception, as the work of Mark shows. The Son of Man tradition is used in the gospel to explain the fact that Jesus in his lifetime was not the Messiah. This would seem to be the explanation of the use of the tradition in Mark and the place in Mark of the theme of the messianic secret. Sjöberg has in fact read the resulting scheme and the secrecy back into Jesus' life. It is a quite different matter to say with Gerhard Gloege¹⁸⁹ that Jesus lived the messianic secret, thus that the Gospel proclaimed the actual secret of his life. Sjöberg wants a full conception of concealment which provided the basis for the christological self-consciousness of Jesus. It is questionable whether the gospel material will support his contention.

We must now look at the discussion of the Son of Man

sayings in the gospel tradition. Bultmann asserted that the only authentic Son of Man sayings are those which refer to a future Son of Man and differentiate him from Jesus whilst the others are either originally "I" sayings or sayings about "man" in general which reveal a later use of the title merely as a description of Jesus without the original apocalyptic meaning, or vaticinia ex eventu about the passion where again the title has become colourless¹⁹⁰. Heinz Eduard Tödt¹⁹¹ made a thorough investigation of the Son of Man sayings in the synoptic gospels and in relation to earlier tradition. He concluded that the only authentic sayings, which do not show marks of belonging to the theology of the early church or the redaction of the evangelists, are a few references to the coming Son of Man which do not identify him with Jesus (Mtt. xxiv 27, 37, 39 and Lk. xvii 30; Lk. xi 30; Mtt. xxiv 44; Lk. xii 8f)¹⁹². These can be said to fit the pattern of Jesus' eschatological preaching, whereas the context, usage or formulation of the other sayings betrays their secondary origin. Of the same opinion is Ferdinand Hahn¹⁹³. It is asserted however that the Son of Man sayings stem from various christological developments in the early church and that they perform a christological function. Thus the earthly Son of Man sayings in 'Q' show awareness by the church that the sayings of

Jesus there preserved represent a continuation of the preaching of Jesus by the church which is made possible by the church's christology¹⁹⁴. It is these earthly Son of Man sayings, however, which Eduard Schweizer¹⁹⁵ thinks are authentic as against the others. For Schweizer they represent Jesus' self-understanding of himself as guarantor of the presence of the kingdom of God, and Jesus' ambiguous description of himself. The difficulty of that view is mainly linguistic in that the phrase which is quite clear as a reference to an apocalyptic figure is not so easily understandable as a straightforward reference to oneself. If it were in regular use as a self-designation it is not easy to see how it could have a special meaning, and if it was impossible as a self-designation then it could only refer to man in general¹⁹⁶. Whether the phrase could be a self-designation in Aramaic is questionable, and whether it could be ambiguous is yet more difficult¹⁹⁷. It is easier to understand the designation of Jesus as Son of Man from a prior identification of Jesus with the coming Son of Man¹⁹⁸.

A different view is taken by Philipp Vielhauer¹⁹⁹ who asserts that the authentic preaching of Jesus in the gospels is that of the coming of the kingdom of God which has nothing to do with the christological concept of the Son of Man, and by Hans Conzelmann²⁰⁰. According to

Conzelmann the Son of Man sayings in the gospels are clearly formulated about Jesus and that the expected Son of Man is clearly none other than Jesus himself, thought of as risen and exalted. There is no indication that the church had come later to identify the one whom Jesus expected with Jesus himself. The Son of Man sayings are used as christological formulations. Jesus is unlikely to have preached another beside himself, because of his own close relation to the expected kingdom of God.

Whatever view we take of this discussion it is clear that the conception of the Son of Man in the tradition is too complex and varied to be the basis of an elaborate scheme in Jesus' self-consciousness as Sjöberg would make it. It is equally evident that it is a pointer to a development in the christology of the early church, closely related to faith in the resurrection and the church's attempts to understand Jesus' life in relation to that faith. Also it is probable that the evangelists have made use of and developed the concept as a key to their accounts of the historical Jesus in relation to the Gospel and the faith of the church. These aspects will need to be borne in mind in the following discussion of the messianic secret.

The latest contribution to the discussion to date is that of T.A. Burkill²⁰¹. Burkill says that Mark did not write a biography of Jesus, and that he was acutely conscious

that Jesus was not adequately recognized during his earthly life. The result of this was the doctrine of the secret²⁰². But (for Mark) the secret also meant that Jesus really was the Messiah, and that it was therefore part of the divine plan that this should not be disclosed during Jesus' earthly life²⁰³. The period of Jesus' earthly life was thus for Mark the time of secret revelation²⁰⁴. This results in places in inconsistency and a strain on the secret, particularly in the later part of the gospel, with the approach of the passion²⁰⁵. There Mark is moving in the direction of a presentation of Jesus similar to that of John, i.e. open revelation which goes unperceived with the passion as the moment of glorification²⁰⁶. The secrecy concept in Mark is part of Mark's philosophy of history and the period of Jesus' earthly life is the second of four epochs in the divine plan of revelation (the others being the advent of the Baptist as forerunner, the post-resurrection preaching of the church, and the open parousia of the Son of Man). It is also a period of concealment²⁰⁷. The inconsistencies in the narrative are the result of Mark's desire to stress the accompanying actual revelation of the Messiah on earth in Jesus²⁰⁸.

Instead of an historical understanding of Mark we have therefore a Markan understanding of history, with the same disadvantages from the point of view of consistency. We have also a development of the view of Wrede in respect of the juxtaposition of concealment and revelation that there is a move discernible in Mark to present Jesus' life in messianic terms. The weakness here is that Mark's work itself appears as inconsistent whereas the inconsistency should probably be seen in the pre-Markan tradition, with the concept of secrecy as an attempt to unify. On Burkill's view Mark has created his own difficulties and concealment and revelation are in conflict as two conflicting aspects of his presentation of Jesus' life. The secrecy is meant only to take account of the awkwardness of history when Mark's real aim is to emphasize Jesus' actual messiahship. The result is self-contradictory. Burkill also finds an inconsistency in the secrecy-theme itself, between the keeping of a secret and the disciples' lack of understanding²⁰⁹. Wrede saw them as independent ways of saying the same thing. They can scarcely be united on Burkill's understanding of the secret as a quasi-historical theological explanation of the fact that Jesus was not openly Messiah in history.

The discussion is however rightly seen by Burkill to

centre on the intention and understanding of Mark over against previous tradition. If we see what this was, in bringing together varied and contradictory material, we shall understand the secrecy theme and the background of the material used. Burkill's criticisms of Vincent Taylor²¹⁰ are therefore important against any attempt to suggest that there is no problem and that Mark's gospel is easily explicable historically as a reflection of Jesus' conception of his messiahship and his living that conception. Merely to assert that Wrede's hypothesis stands or falls with accepting or rejecting the messianic self-consciousness of Jesus is rightly stated to be false²¹¹, and Wrede had of course denied that that question was settled by his work. It would be possible to assert that the idea that Jesus was the Messiah was suggested in his lifetime and was the cause of his death²¹², but yet to claim that it only became a likely suggestion after the resurrection, reinterpreted by the events of Jesus' life and death²¹³. Against Taylor's view that the secrecy is an integral part of the tradition it is pointed out that it is found mainly in editorial sections of Mark²¹⁴. Taylor's view of Jesus' actual messiahship is one based solely on Mark, and his conception that it was hidden seems to contradict the view that it was perceived during Jesus'

lifetime. The view that the secrecy lies in conflicting views of messiahship is difficult because there is no reinterpretation of messiahship in Mark's account beyond the fact that Jesus is called Messiah at all. Indeed the title is rejected rather than affirmed or reinterpreted. Even Cullmann agrees with that²¹⁵ although he advocates extreme reserve for Jesus' attitude to the concept!- if that is the distinction he wishes to draw. Taylor's attempts to show the secrecy elements in Mark as perfectly understandable from a historical point of view are contested²¹⁶. The concept of secrecy cannot be reconciled with Jesus' historical intention as the parables-chapter shows²¹⁷. The commentary of C.E.B. Cranfield²¹⁸ with its theory of a 'messianic veiledness' in Jesus' lifetime faces the same difficulties concerning the editorial and non-historical character of the secrecy-theme in Mark as regards the messiahship of Jesus, and the same difficulties in the theory itself, since it admits concealment during Jesus' lifetime.

The issue as regards Burkill's view is whether it accounts satisfactorily for the concept of secrecy in Mark since he virtually suggests that Mark's understanding of the secret was in fact like those of Taylor and Cranfield, despite Mark's awareness of the fact that the view is not

grounded in history, but in dogma. It is not clear in Burkill why Mark should insist that Jesus was the Messiah, when he knew that this was, as an historical fact, false, nor that Mark's doctrine of concealment went with a desire to present Jesus' life in messianic terms. The secrecy in Mark, as far as Jesus' life is concerned, seems to be complete, and to involve a rejection of the notion of historical messiahship. Over against that notion stands that of the Son of Man, demanding the prior death and resurrection of Jesus before any proclamation of Jesus takes place. The concealment involved here appears in the form of lack of understanding which persists till the resurrection. The secondary nature of the Son of Man material and of Jesus' identification with the Son of Man, which depends on the resurrection, would seem to support the historical implications of Mark's conception and the fact that Mark is aware of them. There is what Burkill calls a 'bipolarity' in Mark's basic position (first suffering and humiliation, then glory and exaltation)²¹⁹ - but no hint of a conflict of feelings about the nature of Jesus' life (though this probably existed in the church and in the pre-Markan tradition). It would be more accurate to speak of an ambiguous attitude to Jesus rather than to Jesus' life, of a christological rather than a historical concern, although

history and Jesus' life play a big part in Mark's conception. There is a real 'bipolarity' with respect of the person of Jesus, rather than a concept of distinct periods or epochs. For this we can cite Mk. viii.38, xiv.62 and xii.35ff., which are crucial christologically as well as in their relation to history and the historical Jesus. The 'bipolarity' is however asserted not overcome. There is a distinct 'strain' in Mark with respect to any christological ascription to the historical Jesus, and yet a conviction of the rightness of such an ascription, over against history, in the post-resurrection Gospel. There is thus a dialectical relationship with history, which involves a christological interpretation of the eschatological challenge of Jesus himself from within history. This is demonstrated in the Marcan parable-chapter (iv) with its insistence from Jesus' preaching, on the sure coming of the kingdom, however unlikely that may now seem. This has become programmatic for the Marcan scheme of concealment and revelation, faith and lack of understanding, with regard to the person of Jesus himself²²⁰ who is set over against and yet associated closely with (and ultimately identified with) the coming Son of Man²²¹. Thus the language of apocalyptic plays a big part, over against history, in ch.xiii. For Mark the

realities of history are important, and in particular the reality of the historical Jesus, but the Gospel is not identified with the history even if it has the history as its presupposition. Thus there is no need for a theological apologetic for the inadequacies of history ²²². Mark's gospel is rather an account of the historical presupposition of the Gospel in the historical Jesus, not an historical account of the Gospel with regard to the historical Jesus, either in intention or in fact (this might be a criticism also of J.M. Robinson The problem of history in Mark London 1957.) The secrecy theme expresses the relation between the historical Jesus and the Gospel, not an ambiguous account of history.

It is along these lines that an investigation of the concept of secrecy in Mark and of its treatment in Matthew and Luke will be carried out in the following chapters. It is clear however that the concept is crucial for an understanding of the Gospel in relation to history and also for an understanding of the nature of the writings we call gospels, their purpose and presuppositions, as well as for a judgment of the nature of the pre-gospel tradition. It seems likely that the priority of Mark will be found to be a theological as well as a literary or chronological truth.

CHAPTER I REFERENCES

- ¹Eng. Trans. The Mystery of the Kingdom of God. The Secret of Jesus' Messiahship and Passion. London 1914, 1925, 1950, 1956.
- ²Eng. trans. The Quest of the Historical Jesus. A critical study of its progress from Reimarus to Wrede. London 1910, 1956.
- ³see Wrede op. cit. p.v.
- ⁴Geheimnis p. 80, Mystery p. 217
- ⁵Geheimnis pp. vi, vii, Mystery, pp. 5, 6.
- ⁶Geheimnis p. vii, Mystery p.6.
- ⁷Geheimnis pp. 63ff, Mystery pp 185ff.
- ⁸Geheimnis pp. 66ff., Mystery pp. 190ff.
- ⁹see Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes Göttingen 1892, 1900.
- ¹⁰Geheimnis pp. viif., Mystery pp. 7f
- ¹¹Geheimnis p. viii, Mystery pp. 8f.
- ¹²Geheimnis p. viii, Mystery pp. 8f
- ¹³see Geheimnis p. vi, Mystery pp. 5f.
- ¹⁴e.g. within the Son of Man material. The Son of Man sayings which are to all appearances earthly self-designations of Jesus in the present are rejected as being the result of a literary process because they conflicted with the scheme which Schweitzer had laid down (see Geheimnis pp. 68ff. Mystery pp. 194ff.)

- 15 see Das Messiasgeheimnis pp. 279ff.
- 16 *ibid* pp. 5f, 148f - a thesis already made much use of by Bruno Bauer.
- 17 *ibid* pp. 2ff.
- 18 *ibid* p. 2.
- 19 Wilhelm Bousset, review in the Theologische Rundschau 1902 p. 362.
- 20 Wilhelm Baldensperger, review in the Theologische Literaturzeitung 27. Jahr 5, July 1902 p.393.
- 21 Wrede *op. cit* p. 125.
- 22 *ibid* pp. 124ff.
- 23 *ibid* pp. 66ff. *and* 113f.
- 24 *ibid* pp. 69ff, 113.
- 25 *ibid* pp. 115ff.
- 26 see the Son of Man sayings at ii 10, 28, which must be uniform with the others in Mark's understanding - *ibid* pp. 16ff.
- 27 *ibid* pp. 101ff.
- 28 *ibid* pp. 117f.

29
 ibid p. 129

30
 ibid pp. 129f.

31
 ibid 131.

32
 ibid pp. 131ff.

33
 ibid pp. 145f.

34
 ibid pp. 66ff.

35
 ibid pp. 150ff.

36
 ibid pp. 143ff. and 179 ff.

37
 ibid p.55.

38
 ibid pp. 207ff.

39
 ibid p.208

40
 ibid p.208f.

41
 ibid p.228

42
 ibid p.220

43
 ibid. p. 219 - here Wrede did not possess Schweitzer's attempts to explain it, but he would probably have seen them as being just as mysterious and dependent on an ordering of the material which was as highly questionable in method as that of the liberals.

- 44
see *ibid* pp. 220ff, esp. pp. 223f.
- 45
ibid pp. 224ff.
- 46
ibid p. 224
- 47
eg. Cullmann The Christology of the New Testament 1959
pp. 124f. Indeed it is wrong to imply that Wrede's stress
was on the negative relation between history and the
Gospel. It was rather on the positive expression of a
consciously post-resurrection faith and the inadequate
understanding of the liberals about the nature and
constitution of the gospel 'narrative' of Mark.
- 48
see for this Acts ii 36, cf. *ibid* pp. 214ff.
- 49
ibid p. 229.
- 50
ibid p. 226.
- 51
ibid p. 227.
- 52
see *ibid* pp. 124ff, and, on the instances of open
messiahship in Mark, *ibid* pp. 222ff.
- 53
ibid p. 228.
- 54
ibid p. 229.
- 55
ibid p. 233.
- 56
ibid pp 231ff.
- 57
ibid p. 235.
- 58
ibid pp. 235ff.

- 59
ibid pp. 237ff.
- 60
ibid pp. 240ff.
- 61
ibid pp. 242ff.
- 62
cf. W. Wrede 'Selbstanzeige, Die christliche Welt 15, 1901, pp. 805f.
- 63
op. cit. p. 362.
- 64
Das älteste Evangelium. Ein Beitrag zum Verständniß des des Markus-Evangeliums und der ältesten evangelischen Überlieferung, Göttingen 1903 pp. 19ff.
- 65
Acts ii 36 - op cit. p. 45, Das Urchristentum Göttingen 1917 p. 23, Eng. tr. Earliest Christianity New York 1959 p. 32.
- 66
see Das älteste Evangelium p. 50, Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes Göttingen 1892 pp. 158ff.
- 67
Das älteste Evangelium p.53.
- 68
Das Urchristentum p. 541, Earliest Christianity p. 693
- 69
Geschichte der Leben Jesu Forschung Tübingen 1951 p. 390, Quest pp. 348f.
- 70
see Christus Die Anfänge des Dogmas, Tübingen 1909 pp. 10ff, Eng. tr. Christ. The beginning of dogma London 1911 pp.20ff.
- 71
see Das Urchristentum pp. 9ff. Primitive Christianity pp.14ff.

- 72 Die Aufgaben der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft in der Gegenwart Gottingen 1908 p. 47.
- 73 Eng. trans. The Quest of the historical Jesus.
- 74 Neue Linien in der Kritik der evangelischen Überlieferung Giessen 1906 p.8.
- 75 Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte der Synoptiker 3 vols. Leipzig 1841-2.
- 76 quoted in Die Geschichte der Leben Jesu Forschung p.375 Quest p. 335.
- 77 Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes' vacation lecture course in Breslau 9th-11th Oct. 1895 printed in Vorträge und Studien Tübingen 1907, cf. Das Messiasgeheimnis pp. 211ff.
- 78 Messiasgeheimnis pp. 214ff.
- 79 ibid p. 145
- 80 see Geschichte p. 383, Quest pp. 342f., cf. Wrede ibid p. 280.
- 81 Geschichte p. 378, Quest p. 338
- 82 cf. Schweitzer Geschichte pp. 381ff., Quest pp. 341ff.
- 83 see Vorträge und Studien pp. 101ff and cf. his rejection of the possibility of Jesus identifying himself with the coming Son of Man in Das Messiasgeheimnis p. 219.

- 84 see Schweitzer, Geschichte pp. 383f., Quest pp. 343f.
- 85 Geschichte pp. 382f., Quest pp. 341f.
- 86 The Life of Christ in recent research Oxford 1907, pp. 69ff. on Wrede, pp. 77ff. on Schweitzer.
- 87 ibid pp. 70 and 74.
- 88 ibid pp. 330ff in the English edition of 1954.
- 89 see e.g. reference to Sanday in A. E. J. Rawlingson's Commentary on St. Mark London 1925 p. 260
- 90 Christianity at the Cross-Roads London 1909, reissued 1963 ed. A. R. Vidler to which reference is made.
- 91 ibid p.57.
- 92 see ibid pp. 50ff generally.
- 93 see op.cit. pp. 258ff.
- 94 Die psychiatrische Beurteilung Jesu Tübingen 1913, The psychiatric study of Jesus Boston 1948.
- 95 in Das messianische Bewusstsein Jesu Strassbourg 1907.
- 96 Von Nazareth nach Golgotha. Eine Untersuchung über die weltgeschichtlichen Zusammenhang des Urchristentums Berlin 1909.
- 97 ibid pp. 150f, 263.

- 98 in 'Der geschichtliche Jesus' Theologische Rundschau 1910 pp. 199ff.
- 99 *ibid* p. 209.
- 100 which he himself changed in Die Menschensohnfrage neuuntersucht Leiden 1916 where he takes the view that the Son of Man sayings are creations of the early church.
- 101 in Kyrios Christos. Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christentums bis Irenaeus. Göttingen 1913, 1921, ref. to 3rd ed. 1926.
- 102 *ibid* pp. 14ff.
- 103 *ibid* p. 66.
- 104 *ibid* pp. 65ff.
- 105 in the review of Wrede in Theologische Rundschau 1902 pp. 307-316, 347-362, Was wissen wir von Jesus? 1904 and early editions of Jesus see Eng. tr. London 1906, cf. German, Tübingen 1907.
- 106 'die Frage nach dem messianischen Bewusstsein Jesu und das Petrus-Bekenntnis Z.N.W. 1919-20 pp. 165ff.
- 107 T.W. Manson is right that its first suggestions were already present in Wrede.
'The Quest of the historical Jesus - continued' 1949 in Studies in the Gospels and Epistles 1962 p.4.
- 108 cf. also Cullmann.
Christology of the New Testament p. 124.
- 109 Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums Tübingen 1933, 1961 Eng. tr. From Tradition to Gospel.

- 110
ibid pp. 231f.
- 111
M. Kähler, Der sogenannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche, biblische Christus. Leipzig. 1892, p.33 n.1, 1896, p.80, Munich 1953, 1961. p. 60.
- 112
Weiss, Jesus von Nazareth, Mythos oder Geschichte? 1910 p.132.
- 113
Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition Göttingen 1981, ref. to ed. 1961 p. 373, Eng. tr. The History of the Synoptic Tradition Oxford 1963 p. 248.
- 114
ibid p. 371, Eng. Tr. p. 346.
- 115
ibid pp. 371f. Eng. p. 346.
- 116
see Theologie des neuen Testaments Tübingen 1953 pp. 26ff, Eng. tr. Theology of the New Testament London 1952 vol 1 pp. 56ff.
- 117
see Theologie pp. 32f., Eng. tr. p. 32.
- 118
cf. his alteration of the original form of Peter's confession seen at Mtt. xvi. 17ff., see 'Die Frage nach dem messianischen Bewusstsein Jesu' Z.N.W. 19 1919-20 pp. 169ff and Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition pp. 276-8 History of the synoptic Tradition pp.258f
- 119
for the latter view cf. E. Bickermann Z.N.W. 22, 1923, pp. 122-140 'Das Messiasgeheimnis und die Komposition des Markusevangeliums'.
- 120
Theologie p.1, Eng. Tr. p.3.
- 121
ibid pp. 34ff, Eng. tr. pp. 33ff.

- 122
ibid p. 394, Eng. tr. vol 2 1955 pp. 47f.
- 123
Reich Gottes und Menschensohn 1934, 1940, Eng. tr.
The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man 1938.
- 124
see 'Messiasgeheimnis und Eschatologie' lecture at the
conference 'Christentum und Welt' 23-29. June 1932
in Nachgelassene Reden und Aufsätze Berlin 1952 pp. 1ff.
see p.3.
- 125
ibid p. 4.
- 126
see Bultmann Jesus Berlin 1926, 1934, Eng. tr.
Jesus and the Word 1935.
- 127
see Schniewind op. cit. pp. 5f.
- 128
ibid pp. 6ff.
- 129
ibid pp. 9ff.
- 130
ibid p.10.
- 131
"as Julicher had maintained, see Die Gleichnisreden Jesu
Tübingen 1910 II p. 532.
- 132
see Schniewind Das Selbstzeugnis Jesu p. 11.
- 133
ibid p.13.
- 134
see Das Evangelium nach Markus Göttingen 1936
- 135
Das Selbstzeugnis Jesu nach dem drei ersten Evangelien,
Berlin 1922 pp. 9f.

- 136 Selbstzeugnis p. 10.
- 137
ibid p.3.
- 138 Theologie pp. 44f., Eng. tr. vol 1 pp. 43f.
- 139
Theologie p. 44, Eng. tr. pp. 43f.
- 140
published as Das Messiasgeheimnis und die Botschaft des Marcus-Evangelisten Beiheft zur Z.N.W. 19, Berlin 1939.
- 141
ibid p. 114.
- 142
ibid pp. 95ff.
- 143
ibid 111f.
- 144
ibid 112f.
- 145
ibid p.97.
- 146
ibid p. 98.
- 147
ibid pp. 144ff.
- 148
ibid pp. 170f, 178, 222.
- 149
ibid pp. 192f.
- 150
ibid pp. 203, 220.
- 151
ibid pp. 199f. v. Wrede, and p. 204.
- 152
ibid pp. 105ff.

- 153
see Theol. Literaturzeitung 65. 1940 pp. 18-22.
- 154
see Gottesknecht und Davidsson, (Stuttgart 1945)
Göttingen 1953.
- 155
ibid p. 12.
- 156
ibid p.48.
- 157
ibid p.70.
- 158
ibid p. 101.
- 159
see Das Evangelium des Markus, Meyer-Kommentar Göttingen
1937, 1959, passim.
- 160
see also, for this view, Das Evangelium des Matthäus,
Meyer-Kommentar, ed. W. Schmauch, Göttingen 1956, 1958.
- 161
see Hans Conzelmann art. 'Jesus Christus' R.G.G. III
p. 634 and Zur Methode der Leben-Jesu Forschung Z.Th. K.
56. 1959 Beiheft 1 Die Frage nach dem historischen Jesus
p. 12.
- 162
as already by Martin Kähler op.cit.
- 163
see Ernst Käsemann 'Das Problem des historischen Jesus'
Z.Th.K. 51. 1954 pp. 125-153 and Exegetische Versuche
und Besinnungen I Göttingen 1960 pp. 187-214, Eng. tr.
Essays on New Testament Themes London 1964, 'The problem
of the historical Jesus' pp. 15ff.
- 164
see Günther Bornkamm Jesus von Nazareth 1956, Eng. tr.
Jesus of Nazareth London 1960 pp. 171f.

165

see Conzelmann 'Gegenwart und Zukunft in der synoptischen Tradition' Z.Th.K. 54. 1957 pp. 293ff., cf. 'Jesus Christus' R.G.G. III pp. 632f.

166

see Mk. ix. 9. 10.

167

'Redaktionsgeschichtliche Erklärung der sogenannten Parabeltheorie des Markus' Z.Th.K. 52, 1955 pp. 255-271.

168

ibid p. 256.

169

ibid pp. 257, 264 v. Jeremias.

170

ibid pp. 267, 270f.

171

Die Botschaft Jesu. Eine traditionskritische und exegetische Untersuchung. Lund 1953, pp. 282ff.

172

ibid p. 272.

173

as well as Das Messiasgeheimnis see 'Zum Thema²⁰ Menschensohn' Z.N.W. 1904 pp. 359f.

174

viii 31 Mark.

175

viii 38 Mark.

176

Der verborgene Menschensohn in den Evangelien. Lund 1955.

177

ibid pp. 1-40.

- 178
see *ibid* pp. 41-98.
as Tödt Der Menschensohn points out against Dibelius the
concealment of the Son of Man had always been a heavenly,
not an earthly one. pp.53f.
- 179
ibid pp. 100ff.
- 180
ibid p. 115.
- 181
ibid p. 116.
- 182
ibid pp. 116f.
- 183
see also Gerhardsson Memory and Manuscript pp. 267ff
based largely on Matthew.
- 184
ibid pp. 125ff.
- 185
ibid pp. 132ff, 142ff.
- 186
ibid pp. 150ff.
- 187
ibid pp. 218ff.
- 188
see H. E. Tödt Der Menschensohn in der synoptischen
Überlieferung Gütersloh 1959 pp 272f.
- 189
Aller Tage Tag Stuttgart 1960, Eng. tr. The day of his
coming London 1963 p.228.
- 190
see Theologie pp. 29ff. Eng. tr. pp. 28ff.
- 191
op. cit.

- 192
see Tödt. op. cit. pp. 206f.
- 193
Christologische Hoheitstitel Göttingen 1963, pp. 13ff.
- 194
Tödt op cit pp.231ff.
- 195
see esp. 'Der Menschensohn' Zur eschatologischen Erwartung Jesu Z.N.W. 50 1959 pp. 185ff.
- 196
see Hahn op. cit. p. 24.
- 197
Hahn p. 25 on the linguistic question see also Vielhauer, cited below Z.Th.K. 1963 pp. 158f.
- 198
Hahn op. cit. p. 26.
- 199
'Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesu' Festschrift für Günther Dehn 1957 pp. 51ff., and 'Jesus und der Menschensohn' Z.Th.K. 60. 1963 pp. 133ff.
- 200
Gegenwart und Zukunft; op. cit., pp. 282ff. See also Ernst Käslmann op. cit. pp. 210f., Eng. p. 43.
- 201
Mysterious Revelation. An Examination of the Philosophy of St. Mark's Gospel. New York 1963, following on, and in part incorporating, a long series of articles.
- 202
ibid p.2.
- 203
ibid pp. 69, 319.
- 204
ibid pp. 159, 179.
- 205
ibid pp. 69f, 322f.

- 206
ibid p. 70.
- 207
ibid pp. 175, 320f.
- 208
ibid pp. 177ff, 209, 321ff.
- 209
ibid pp. 104ff, 187, 324.
- 210
The Gospel according to St. Mark. London 1952.
- 211
Burkill op. cit. p. 210.
- 212
For this suggestion cf. also Hahn op. cit. pp. 176ff)
and N.A. Dahl ('Der gekreuzigte Messias', Der historische
Jesus und der kerygmatische Christus Berlin 1960,
pp. 159f. This possibility is not considered by
W. Manson Jesus the Messiah London 1943 see p.11.
- 213
op. cit. pp. 211f.
- 214
op. cit. pp. 213f.
- 215
Christology of the New Testament p. 125
- 216
op. cit. pp. 215f.
- 217
op. cit. pp. 216f.
- 218
The Gospel according to St. Mark, Cambridge 1959.
- 219
pp. 320ff.

220

See Mk. iv. 21ff.

221

The question of the use of the Son of Man sayings in Mark may be significant for, but not the same as the issue of their authenticity. But, of course, the question of their authenticity is important for the historical background to the concept of secrecy in Mark.

222

see Burkill op. cit. p. 320.

CHAPTER TWO

The Concealed Messiahship in Mark.

The previous chapter has tried to show that investigation of the theme of the messianic secret is concerned not only with isolated verses but with the gospel of Mark as a whole, its structure, purpose and content, its relation to previous tradition as well as its own nature. Interpretation of the theme has also been shown to be crucial for the interpretation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ as it appears in the tradition about Jesus and as it is presented in the gospels. This chapter is therefore concerned with the structure of the gospel of Mark in the hope that study of Mark's use of earlier tradition will be valuable not only to reveal Mark's intentions but also the nature of the earlier tradition itself, and hence the nature of the Gospel in addition to its historical implications. For this purpose it will be necessary to centre the investigation on the theme of secrecy, but expound it in relation to the structure of the gospel as a whole.

(i) Mk. i. 1, - The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ

The significance of Mark's opening verse - Ἀρχὴ τοῦ
εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ -

is easier to perceive, in general terms, than its precise meaning or syntax in relation to what follows. The verse certainly does not represent a literary title referring to the beginning of a book, and the word εὐαγγέλιον must be taken in its theological meaning rather than the later literary meaning. A list of possible interpretations is found in Cranfield's commentary¹. The meaning of the verse must be decided in large part from its relation to the following three verses and from their relation to each other.

VV. 2 and 3 should be taken together although they do not represent a single quotation from Isaiah. They are introduced merely by καθώς. V. 4 also begins with a simple ἔγένετο, which hardly fits grammatically with the rest of the sentence since it is followed by a participial construction. The position of the verb at the beginning of the sentence is also unusual. i. 1 might be taken as either subject or predicate of ἔγένετο in V. 4, with VV. 2, 3 in parenthesis; or it might be taken closely with VV. 2, 3: or VV. 2, 3 might be taken with V.4, leaving V.1 as a title for the whole, or part, of what follows.

A decision on this should be in large part determined

by the sense of each alternative and the content of the verses. It seems unlikely that Mark would begin his work with a statement that the beginning of the Gospel was in accordance with scripture or was comprised in a particular event the appearance of John the Baptist in the desert. That would require a conception of the Gospel as an entity arising from a prophetic utterance or as a process which began at a particular time. It seems unlikely that either καθώς or ἐγένετο should be stressed as connecting links with V.1. They would seem rather, to emphasize the contents of the verses they introduce. There is, however, a clear connection of content between VV. 2, 3 and V. 4 and a relation of prophetic word and actual event. There must also be some relation between VV. 2,3,4, and V.1, but not one of identity. It is as if Mark, his main concern being with the Gospel of Jesus Christ, was saying that the presupposition of that Gospel was found both in Old Testament prophecy and in actual event fulfilling that prophecy, this being the force of καθώς and ἐγένετο. He is not identifying the beginning of the Gospel with these things, but asserting that this is where all mention of the Gospel must begin and that basic to the Gospel is prophecy and historical event. But this does not mean

that the Gospel should be identified with an account which begins with these things. The following writing is not hereby called εὐαγγέλιον, which would require that ἀρχή should have the sense of 'incipit' - here begins - or that the following events should be stressed as the beginning of the Gospel, with i.1 as a title for VV. 1-8. It would seem rather that the reader is told that here we are right at the beginning and that the Gospel of Jesus Christ will be the result. There is no stress on this section in itself, but only on its connection with the point of all that follows. i.1 is not a descriptive title for anything but an indication of the fact that the work as a whole is concerned with the 'origin' of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. This means that, starting from John the Baptist, i.1 could refer to any part of what follows. i.1 is therefore not concerned with indicating the chronological starting-point of the Gospel but with pointing out that we are here concerned with the basis of the Gospel beginning from John the Baptist. This explains the loose grammatical connection of the opening verses.

The manner in which Mark has been constructed fits the theological implications intended in the work. It has been

often pointed out that Mark's gospel has been constructed backwards from the passion and resurrection². This was mainly a theological judgment about the literary character of the gospels, and Mark in particular, but it is one of far-reaching importance for both the literary and theological character of the construction of the gospel, and for its interpretation. Willi Marxsen has stressed this view with regard to the present context³ and pointed out that since the connection here between VV. 2, 3 and V.4 must be the work of Mark and that they could not have existed together earlier, then it is clear that VV. 2,3 have been placed prior to vv. 4 ff. rather than VV. 4ff constructed to follow VV 2,3. This is opposed to the interpretation of Lohmeyer⁴ that VV. 2,3 introduce the event which fulfills the prophecy and comprises the beginning of the Gospel. According to Marxsen this means that Mark's gospel reads backwards rather than forwards with the stress at the end rather than the beginning. There is no progression of events forwards with a causal and chronological connection, but a reflection back, with each stage dependent on what follows. This means, then, that the Gospel is not seen to be itself beginning at

this point, but that the origin of the Gospel has been traced back to its source. Behind the Gospel and behind the life of Jesus there is John the Baptist and there is Old Testament prophecy⁵. Right at the beginning it is made clear that what we are reading in the gospel is concerned with the Gospel of Jesus Christ, but not directly. What is presented to us throughout is the presupposition of that Gospel.

Thus we see here that one stage gives way to the next and depends on the next for its significance. After the event of John is the event of Jesus (see ἐγένετο V.9) or, rather, the event of John precedes that of Jesus. The Old Testament prophecy comes alive in the appearance of John, and John's message comes alive in the appearance of Jesus (see VV. 8, 10). Jesus' role is made plain by God himself (V.11).

References for Chapter Two

Section (i)

- 1
on Mark op. cit. pp. 34f.
- 2
see references in Ebeling op.cit. p. 221
- 3
Der Evangelist Markus. Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte
des Evangeliums. Göttingen 1959, pp 17ff.
- 4
commentary on Mark op.cit. p. 10.
- 5
see Marxsen op. cit. p. 88.

(ii) Jesus and the Gospel, - Mk. i.1, 14f.

After John's disappearance from the scene Jesus appears anew, preaching the Gospel (VV. 14f). But the Gospel here is a Gospel preached by Jesus and not a Gospel about Jesus, which we might presume to be the case at i.1. The Gospel at i.14 is the Gospel of God. But, if these two are to be distinguished, their proximity in Mark is too close for the evangelist not to have intended a relationship between them. In any case the phrase εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ at i.1 is ambiguous and we might have here either a subjective or an objective Genitive. But it is at 1.14 that Jesus begins to preach the Gospel. The distinction should make it plain that Jesus' preaching at i.14 is not the historical beginning of the Gospel of i.1, at least in the sense that here we have the Gospel of Jesus Christ beginning.

But J. M. Robinson¹, who considers that Mark wrote 'theologically understood history'², asks whether one is to see the Gospel beginning with John the Baptist or with Jesus' preaching of the Gospel in VV. 14f. Both views were, according to Robinson, held in the early church (see Acts i.22, x. 27). But in Mark, John's ministry, which

lies between the future tenses of the prophecies of VV. 2f and the perfect tenses of Jesus' proclamation in V.15, must be the time of the beginning of the Gospel.

Against Robinson, it is to be doubted whether there is any emphasis here on chronology or on a historical 'event of fulfilment', or that the Gospel in i.1 is to be identified with that in i.14. Mark is not progressing from a decisive event to describe the Gospel, but he is still in some way concerned with the 'origin' of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. He is not describing the 'Geschehen des Evangeliums' (the event of the Gospel)³. The preaching and baptism of John do not comprise the beginning of the Gospel proclaimed in V.15. There is no chronological significance in what Jesus preaches in V.15. John's removal at V.14 implies theological priority not chronological sequence⁴. There is no emphasis in V.15 on what went before. But we have Jesus' historical preaching in the form of his demand at the time for a response in the present with regard to the future. It was Jesus alone who made that demand in proclaiming the Gospel. This stands now in the larger context of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The interest of Jesus' proclamation lies not so much in the historical fact of the proclamation itself

but in its relation to the Gospel about Jesus Christ of i.1 And i.1 is not just pointing out that at a certain time Jesus began to preach the Gospel. The Gospel of Jesus Christ arises out of and depends on this preaching by Jesus, but the relation is not temporal but christological. The relation lies in the person of Jesus himself, though this is by no means explicit in i.15. This was the 'origin' of the Gospel because the Gospel depends on Jesus himself. The relation between Jesus and the Gospel is like the relation in Jesus' preaching between Jesus and the kingdom of God. Just as it is difficult to say whether Jesus brings the kingdom or the kingdom brings Jesus, so it is with the Gospel. He is the origin and fulfilment both of the proclamation of the kingdom and of the Gospel, and is therefore the author as well as the content of the Gospel. Neither the kingdom of God nor the Gospel about Jesus Christ are explicitly present in Jesus' historical preaching, but they are implicit in his person, by reflection back from the Gospel.

It is thus that Mark can claim to present the origin of the Gospel of and about Jesus Christ and this

is the relevance of Jesus' eschatological Gospel to the christological Gospel of the church and the relationship between i.1 and i.14f. Thus the church's Gospel is more than a verbal reiteration of Jesus' historical preaching, but it depends on that preaching. This is the point of the repetition of Jesus' preaching of the Gospel of God in the context of an exposition of the ἀρχή of the Gospel of Jesus Christ and it is also an explanation of Mark's gospel.

Mark is both concerned with the Gospel about Jesus Christ of his own day, and with Jesus' historical Gospel about the kingdom of God. He differentiates between them, but he relates them to each other in the person of Jesus such that one is part of the origin of the other. Marxsen's explanation of Mark's concern with Jesus' eschatological Gospel is different. He does not see the Gospel of i.1 identified with that of i.14 in the sense that the former is said to start with the latter in history but in the sense that the latter is reiterated in the former, in the present, as a continuation of Jesus' preaching. For Marxsen Mark's concern is not historical, neither is it christological,

but it is eschatological. He considers that Mark is concerned with the Gospel in his own day, but with the time of Jesus as the starting-point of that Gospel⁵.

This Gospel is eschatological in the sense that it is to be fulfilled in Mark's own day. There is no interest in the significance of the eschatological preaching of Jesus in Jesus' lifetime. The Jesus who appears in the gospel is the one who is himself the Gospel of God, the one who brought it and who will bring it to fulfilment in the near future. Thus the account of Jesus in the gospel is an account of the beginning of the eschatological Gospel of Jesus which must now find its fulfilment.

But this interpretation of Marxsen fails to note that it is not the eschatological Gospel of Jesus which Mark sees as contemporary, but the christological Gospel of Jesus Christ, to which Jesus' eschatological preaching is brought to bear witness. He also fails to note that the Gospel of Jesus Christ is more than a verbal reiteration of Jesus' eschatological Gospel since its subject is Jesus himself. Thus ἀρχή means more than chronological beginning. The fact that Mark's main concern is christological should also become clearer as the gospel

progresses, if it is not already clear enough. Both history and eschatology are important, but subservient to this concern. Jesus' historical preaching, which was eschatological in character, is recognized as having been superseded. Its sole explanation is now in terms of the church's Gospel of Jesus Christ. This is the truth in the statement of Gloege that the eschatological message of Jesus is explicable in terms of Jesus' person⁶ and of Burkill⁷ that eschatology interests Mark for its christological implications. Schniewind's view⁸ of the messianic secret as the eschatological secret of the presence of the kingdom in Jesus' person should be accepted for the understanding of Mark in his construction of his gospel and not for the historical situation itself. Schniewind depends on Mark for his assertion. But Mark is not concerned so much with the historical context of Jesus' preaching, but with the context of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. He is concerned with the history as the ἀρχή of that Gospel. This is the definition of what he is writing which Mark has already expressed.

It is from this that we can understand Mark's narrative of Jesus and his preaching. He wishes to present the relation between Jesus (and that means the historical

Jesus) and the Gospel. The Gospel is not what Jesus proclaimed historically. But it is concerned with Jesus who did preach in history and it gives validity now to what Jesus preached then. But it does so in terms of his person.⁹ This was what was lacking during Jesus' earthly life, which in itself is of no concern. Mark does not give us a 'pre-history' of the Gospel.¹⁰ But he demonstrates the earthly life of Jesus as the precondition of the Gospel. Part of this precondition is Jesus' calling of disciples in VV. 16ff. The disciples' following of Jesus will also be seen later to have in Mark a christological rather than an eschatological significance, even though it is recognized that this was not so in Jesus' life-time, or only inadequately so. The disciples did not follow with a perception of the Gospel, but their actual following comes to have christological significance. There is in Mark both a 'believing representation of the divine Master and historical information about the events of Jesus' life'.¹¹ But it is only true that historical facts ('Tatsachen') become transparent in face of the majesty of the Master to reveal the might of His divine word¹² in the Gospel

about Jesus Christ. This was how the tradition was used in the church kerygma, and this is how it is used in the context of a narrative about Jesus, presented as the ἀρχή of the Gospel. Mark does not historicize the picture of Jesus in the kerygmatic tradition, but brings out the relation between history and Gospel in the person of Jesus himself. It is no more right to see here the kernel of the Gospel within the history than to look for a historical kernel in the narrative of which the evangelist was not conscious. Mark presents both history and Gospel, but he keeps them distinct. It is the relation of the historical Jesus to the Gospel that interests him. Historical events, and Jesus' own historical preaching, have their relevance under this heading. They do not comprise the Gospel, and are not recounted as such. They define, to some extent, the historical Jesus, who he was, but he himself is ultimately not defined by them but by the Gospel. Thus the Gospel Jesus preached is differentiated from the Gospel about Jesus, but in that he preached it it comes to have significance in relation to his person.

References for Chapter Two

Section (ii)

- 1
The Problem of history in Mark
- 2
ibid pp 21ff.
- 3
see Lohmeyer op. cit. p. 10.
- 4
Marxsen op. cit. p. 30.
- 5
see Der Evangelist Markus pp 87ff.
- 6
The day of his coming p. 128
- 7
op. cit. p. 102.
- 8
see commentary on Mark op. cit. pp. 16f, 122, 130.
- 9
see Tödt op. cit. p. 227, in Mark 'Christian preaching is not concerned with the continuation of Jesus' preaching but with the Gospel about Jesus Christ' (i.1).
- 10
see Conzelmann, 'Gegenwart und Zukunft' p. 290.
- 11
Lohmeyer op. cit. p. 31.
- 12
ibid p. 33.

(iii) The identity of Jesus, in history and Gospel(1.9ff,21ff.)

Mark's redactional work is not only noticeable in editorial additions to older traditions but is also evident in the use made of older traditions themselves in the construction of the gospel. These older traditions were naturally accounts of Jesus and in narrative form, but their point and purpose had been the proclamation of Jesus in the service of the Gospel. There is every reason to think that Mark took them over for what they were and that he used them in accordance with their origin. He recognized in them the reference to the historical Jesus and also their formulation from the point of view of the Gospel. His longer account of the historical Jesus, constructed from these sources, can be seen as an exposition of the relation between the historical Jesus and the Gospel, and his editorial additions are therefore reminders of that fact. Thus his intention cannot have been to write a historical account, nor an account of the Gospel, but an exposition of the relation between history and the Gospel about Jesus Christ, himself an identifiable figure of history. This would seem to be an explanation of the form and content of the gospel of Mark so far.

We must consider here how the identity of Jesus is demonstrated in the gospel, which is important for the theme of secrecy. Mark has placed at the beginning a divine statement of Jesus' identity (i.11). This belongs to a tradition of Jesus' baptism by John and recounts the bestowal of the Spirit on Jesus, with the divine voice addressing Jesus alone about his status¹. Hahn² reckons with a tradition of Hellenistic Jewish Christianity, which has been changed, from an originally eschatological and Palestinian tradition about the institution of the servant of God to proclaim the imminence of God's reign and salvation, to one concerned with the beginning of the earthly activity of the Son of God, itself seen as having saving significance. But this is not the level on which Mark continues; he does not encourage a process by which the life of Jesus is presented in openly messianic or supernatural terms. From this narrative it must be presumed that Mark thought of Jesus as aware of his status, but this is not an aspect which is stressed. Schniewind is right³ that Mark's intention is not to describe an experience of Jesus' self-consciousness but to present a first narrative of Jesus to illuminate what follows. The narrative is not messianic or adoptionist⁴ in the sense

that implies this to be the time when Jesus became Messiah or Son of God, or was so designated. The identity of Jesus remains a secret as far as history is concerned.

The question of Jesus' identity is involved in, and raised by, the crowd's questioning about his ἐξουσία in teaching and exorcism (i 22, 27). The demons' cries seem intended to provide supernatural insight into the question of Jesus' identity⁵. The substance is provided by Mark as the key to the question about Jesus' authority but the utterance is apparently neither heard nor allowed to be heard (V.34). Both of these aspects are stressed by Mark. The utterance and the silencing are both christological in character. The command to be silent would be too late to prevent the cries ^{being} ~~to be~~ heard, and the original point may have been a general one in exorcisms that the demon tried to defend himself by a contrary attack on the exorcist in person. But Mark shows in V.34⁶ that his interest is in the possibility of Jesus' identity becoming generally known as a result of the demons' cries. The point of the remark is not so much to explain the fact that the demons' cries were not heard with the possibility that they might have been heard as to assert that they were not heard and that they had not to be heard. The

correctness of the demon's! description of Jesus is admitted but it is regarded as inappropriate. Mark does not stress the historical fact of Jesus' status so much as the fact that his status required supernatural insight to be discerned at the time, but that it was not, and was not to be generally perceived. Mark's narrative is therefore inconsistent as history⁷ and must therefore be viewed as history seen from the view-point of the Gospel.

The secrecy-theme here would be too complex and clumsy as an attempt to write an account of Jesus' historical messiahship allowing at the same time for its being indiscernable in history. This is the difficulty with Burkill's view of Mark as presenting a philosophy of history. It seems rather that Mark insists on Jesus' messiahship, but also insists that it was not recognized in history and could not be, but that what is later asserted about him is correct and can only later be discerned in the history itself.

We shall see later that Mark's difficulty is not merely with unmessianic⁸ history - indeed there may have been messianic elements in the history - but with the very nature of Jesus' messiahship, which made any historical description of Jesus in messianic or similar terms

inadequate, and even false. Mark's difficulty is with messiahship itself, and Jesus' messiahship in particular. The secrecy-theme suggests that Mark had no wish to describe Jesus in messianic terms in history since the terms were inadequate for Jesus and, as historical, inadequate for a proper conception of messiahship, which only Jesus would fulfil⁹. Thus the supernatural element in these passages is, in fact, meant to be set over against history, and the questions which arise from Jesus' life (i 22, 27).

Since Mark's concern here is christological rather than historical, issue must be taken with the view of J.M. Robinsosn that 'In the Marcan presentation they (i.e. the exorcism narratives) depict a cosmic struggle in history to inaugurate the eschatological reign of God'¹⁰ and that Mark wrote 'cosmic history'. It has already been stated that interest centres in Mark on the Gospel of Jesus Christ and only on Jesus' eschatological preaching and activity in history as subservient to that Gospel. There is no concern with Jesus' life as the time of fulfilment apart from the significance of Jesus' person as proclaimed in the Gospel. And Jesus' own eschatological Gospel has itself become secondary to the

Gospel about Jesus Christ. The particulars of Jesus' life are important in that they identify the one whom the Gospel is about. But the Gospel adds something which is not available in the historical particulars themselves. This seems to be the point of the theme of secrecy here, and the point of the ascription of christological utterance to the demons of exorcisms, whom Jesus silences. This theme is ignored by Robinson, although it is the most characteristic aspect of Mark's account and clearly of major importance for the evangelist. It is, of course, equally clear that Mark accepts the rightness of the content of the demons' cries and wishes to stress that content as an answer to the questioning of the crowds who surrounded Jesus in history. But at the same time that answer was not given to the crowds and was not allowed to be given; not because it was not appropriate at the time or in those circumstances¹¹ - since the theme of secrecy persists throughout the gospel - but because it was not and could not be given in history at all during Jesus' life, but would be given later. Also it is not the case that Mark saw Jesus' life as a process which was concealed from the general view, but that he saw in history the roots of the Gospel about Jesus Christ and that, apart from that

Gospel, who Jesus is, or was, remains concealed. Thus his identity is known only to supernatural insight beyond the processes of history, hence to God and the demons. The emphasis of Mark is christological rather than historical or eschatological. The so-called messianic secret seems to preclude the possibility that Mark intended to write a messianic history, but it does show that Mark's interest in both history and eschatology was of a christological kind.

References for Chapter Two

Section (iii)

- 1
cf. Burkill op. cit. p. 16.
- 2
Christologische Hoheitstitel pp. 340ff.
- 3
op. cit. p. 14.
- 4
see Hahn op. cit. pp. 344f.
- 5
cf. Nineham St. Mark, commentary, London 1963 p.77.
- 6
see Lohmeyer op. cit. p. 41.
- 7
cf. Burkill, op. cit. pp. 71f, 104f.
- 8
against Wrede and Burkill.
- 9
cf. viii. 29ff., xii. 35ff and xiv. 62.
- 10
Problem of History p. 38, see pp. 39ff.
- 11
There is no suggestion in Mark that the point was that it was ill-befitting for demons to give testimony to Jesus' messiahship.

(iv) i 14-20, 21-39, the 'typical day' in Jesus' ministry: history, eschatology, and christology.

The relationship between these three things in Mark needs careful investigation. We have already pointed out that any discussion of Mark which forgets christology and concentrates on one or other of the other two, or on both, with whatever emphasis, misses the point of the Marcan narrative altogether. This is not to say that there is not history behind Mark's gospel, nor that eschatology has got no recognition in it, but it is to say that their relevance in Mark is geared to christology. Thus Mark does not provide us with a historical account, not even an eschatological view of history, nor with an eschatological challenge in the present, but with each of these in relation to christology.

Dodd claimed that the eschatology of Jesus was a 'realized eschatology' and this description was later modified by Jeremias, on the suggestion of Ernst Haenchen and accepted by Dodd, as a 'sich realisierende Eschatologie'.¹ Haenchen said that Jesus preached 'die sich von jetzt ab verwirklichende Gottesherrschaft' (i.e. 'inaugurated eschatology'), the key to which was to be found in Jesus himself². But these are ultimately christological statements about the significance of Jesus' eschatological preaching

and only express the significance of that preaching as it appears in Mark. Thus Schniewind's assertion that Jesus is the 'autobasileia'³ is right from the point of view of the church's christological reinterpretation of Jesus' preaching but not from the point of view that Mark is describing eschatological history within which there lies the secret of Jesus' person. The secret of Jesus' person is present in Jesus' eschatological preaching but this is evident in the Gospel and manifestly not in the history.

This is the setting for the silencing of the demons' cries in the context of Jesus' eschatological preaching and activity. Those cries could not have been heard historically, yet there is no answer to the question of Jesus' authority in any other terms although they are only made plain in the Gospel. The answer given in the Gospel is also the only right answer to the problems implied in, and the questions raised by, Jesus' historical preaching and activity, although that answer is not provided with them. History and eschatology appear as being without answers to the questions they raise, but they provide the basis for the answer which the Gospel provides in Jesus' person and proclamation. But he did not proclaim himself (e.g. in VV. 38, 39) as the Gospel does. Mark's gospel, however, in its account of Jesus

does reveal to us the Gospel about Jesus. Only in this way is it right that 'Evangelium heisst.... einfach Erzählung von Jesus Christus'⁴. But an historical account itself would not be that Gospel, even with the eschatological preaching of Jesus included, but would describe the presupposition for the Gospel and demand the Gospel for its explanation. The meaningful connection of history and eschatology with the Gospel is in terms of Jesus' person, as proclaimed by the Gospel.⁵

References for Chapter Two

Section (iv)

- 1
Jeremias Die Gleichnisse Jesu Göttingen, 1958, 1960, p.194,
Eng. The parables of Jesus London 1954 p.159, 1963, p.230.
(*'eschatology in process of realization'*).
2. see Kasemann Exegetische Versuche p.212, Essays p.44.
3. see his commentary on Mark op.cit. pp.18f.
4. see Hirsch Frühgeschichte des Evangeliums I, Tübingen 1951
p. 191.
5. Criticism of the view that the kingdom should be seen as
present in history with Jesus' person is found also in
Tödt op.cit. pp. 237ff.

(v) The secret and the problem of history; the
debates - Mk. i.40ff., ii. 1 - iii.6.

In the following section, which is introduced by the parabolic miracle-story of cleansing of the leper, Jesus, who has been indicated for the readers of the gospel by the divine voice as the Son of God, and who, as such, has exorcised demons, is confronted in history by men, and there, at one and the same time, he is both contradicted and borne witness to. His basic historicity, even when preached by the Gospel and in the kerygma of the church, is made plain, but its offence is not thereby reduced. Historically Jesus is the hidden Son of God, and Son of Man, who fails to be a historical Messiah. This is all seen, however, from the standpoint of the church kerygma and the dialectical relationship between history and the Gospel which is thereby revealed. This dialectic is the explanation of the equivocality of the picture of Jesus in Mark and the presence at once of both concealment and revelation in his account. The story of the cleansing of the leper is a parable of this ambiguity and the following debates illustrate it.

i. 40ff has all the signs of being the result of a long process of development and addition, though the exact process cannot be traced. Basic to it would seem to be

a simple miracle-story represented by VV. 40f¹. This is preferable to Lohmeyer's suggestion that there were two independent stories which have been interwoven². According to Lohmeyer VV. 41a (with ὀργισθεῖς), 43, 44a, 45 belonged to one, VV. 41a (with σπλαγχνισθεῖς), 44b, the other. Thus VV. 40 and 41, with one variation or another, are necessary to both, and still shown to be fundamental. We are still faced with a process of accretion or with the conjunction of different elements. The contradiction in the story is, however, the result of the command to silence set over against V.45. The resulting difficulties make the story ideal for Mark's purposes, although read purely on the level of history it has little meaning. Jesus is openly proclaimed as the one who had cleansed the leper, but the meaning of that cleansing remains hidden, although his attempts to hide behind the official cultic cleansing were foiled. That cultic cleansing, or declaring clean, if in fact it was carried out, would itself have borne indirect testimony to Jesus' having cleansed the leper first - see εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῦ, V.44. The evidence of the cultus could then have been brought to incriminate Jesus' opponents.³ Jesus' historical cleansing of the leper has wider significance and implications, although they were missed and the cleansing was a source of offence at the time. The open proclamation of Jesus in V.45 does not then

contradict V.44 but is another aspect of the same picture of concealment which Jesus' actual fame as a miracle-worker reinforces.

The prohibition to speak of the miracle can thus be seen as pointing out where the interest of the story lies. It is connected with the command to go to the priest and is intended to emphasize the concealment of Jesus' own previous cleansing of the leper. The ambiguity in the expression 'cleansed', between the sense of physical healing and cultic declaring clean, reinforces the significance of the relation between Jesus' action and that of the priest. The priest's action could only witness to what in fact Jesus had already done. In relation to V.45 the prohibition stresses the fact of concealment so far as the real significance of Jesus' actions go. Thus, according to Mark, we have the historical evidence of Jesus and yet the historical testimony is indirect. The Gospel discloses the actual secret of Jesus' life, but Jesus' life is the actual presupposition of that Gospel.

Historically, Jesus' cleansing of the leper must have been highly questionable and demanded the official cleansing ceremony of the cultus, yet, ironically, that ceremony was no longer needed and in its performance was merely a witness to Jesus. The Mosaic cultus had in fact capitulated to the Christ, though this was a later insight

of the church. The past event is important but not sufficient in itself because even in the thronging of the crowds around the historical Jesus (V.45) the Christ is not disclosed. The emphasis here is on Jesus as disclosed by the Gospel not on historical event. Thus it is not enough for Sjöberg to say that the messiahship of Jesus was in fact historically concealed despite the fact that the miracle was not⁴. The concealment is historical in the sense that it was a concealment by and in history itself and not a matter of concealing this or that fact at the time. The structure of and contradiction within the theme of secrecy in this pericope between VV. 44 and 45 shows the secondary nature of its construction and the fact that the concealment is involved in the difference and relation between history and the Gospel: what has been called their dialectical relationship. Any historical secret there may have been was in fact divulged, but the real secret, that of the history itself, remained intact, and remains intact, apart from the Gospel about Jesus Christ. Individual motifs of secrecy there may have been already in the tradition, where that tradition was used in the context of the church's kerygma, and they may have historical foundations, but they form in Mark a larger structure with wider implications. Because Mark is not simply writing an historical account

but an account of history in relation to the Gospel the historical difficulties of the theme as a whole are, as here, useful and offer no difficulties to the evangelist.

The theme of secrecy accepts positively the difficulties of history with regard to the messiahship of Jesus and precludes a search for Jesus the Messiah within history alone. At the same time the church's preaching of Jesus is shown to be continuous with Jesus⁵. With respect to the so-called 'new quest of the historical Jesus', the continuity between the Jesus of history and the Christ of faith is to be found solely in the Gospel of the resurrection. Mark was not an apologist for their historical identity. History and Gospel are not confused but they are related christologically with reference to Jesus himself. The identity of Jesus is, however, only validly perceived in the Gospel. The history is thus the *ἀρχή* of the Gospel because of Jesus. Mark did not⁶ see Jesus as Messiah on earth nor view 'the life of Jesus' as 'the earthly career of the Messiah' and present it as such in his gospel. Mark was concerned with the Gospel not the life of Jesus in itself apart from that Gospel. He did see more than bare facts in the miracles, but yet the miracles were bare facts which required the Gospel if a deeper meaning was to be perceived, a meaning which the crowds of V.45 did not and could not perceive.

Mark's conscious use of previous tradition in both its historical and kerygmatic aspects is of great interest, and the key to it is in the theme of secrecy.

The theme of secrecy is meant to bring out and express a relationship latent and implicit within the earlier tradition. It is not a historical 'theory' nor a philosophy of history. It reflects something seen to be present in the history itself - from the stand-point of the Gospel - and not from within history itself. The Gospel reveals the secret along with Jesus' messiahship. It was added to the tradition⁷, but not in the sense of a device to reconcile messianic and unmessianic material, as Wrede thought, but to guard against the production of a messianic life of Jesus and emphasise the fact that a valid perception of Jesus' messiahship depends on the church's Gospel of the resurrection, and to depict the nature of the continuity which exists with the historical Jesus. As such, secrecy is basic to every account of Jesus in the gospel so that the messianic secret is a constant factor throughout. Schniewind asserted this as a reflection of the nature of Jesus' life but his interpretation fails to see that the secret itself comes to light only with the Gospel. In history there was only the fact that Jesus was not the Messiah. The dialectic lies between history and the Gospel and not within the history itself. This is plain from the fact that the particular

motifs of secrecy are secondary, and in so far as they may be authentic they probably had a different sense in history from that which they now have in Mark, as the gospel has been constructed. Mark was not intent to say that Jesus really was the Messiah, but to demonstrate that Jesus is now rightly seen to be the Messiah. Mark had no conception of a historical messiahship (see xii, 35ff). On the historical level the command to silence in V.44 refers to the miracle, and as such it is disobeyed, but the messianic secret, the hidden fact of Jesus' significance, persists, and is only evident to those who know and accept the Gospel and to Mark's readers who have already been privileged to hear the divine voice at the baptism and the cry of the exorcised demons. The world contemporary with Jesus heard neither, nor was it aware of a secret.⁸ Mark's account of the origin of the Gospel brings to light the content of both from the stand-point of that Gospel. This is the explanation of the theme of secrecy in Mark with regard to history, rather than Schniewind's, because of the place of the theme in the tradition, setting as it does, history over against the Gospel and also relating them. The presentation of the Gospel in the form of stories about Jesus in the kerygma is the background of the gospel of Mark, who gives an account of the relation between history and

The Gospel in the form of an account of Jesus' historical existence, using the previous kerygmatic and historical tradition. The secrecy is a necessary aspect of this process.

We have the explanation of how in this pericope, news of the miracle is spread abroad, but the messianic secret is not. The theme of secrecy here has two related functions: it has a historical application, and also shows how the real secret stands over against the history itself. The validity of the application to Jesus of the title Messiah is shown to have been important to Mark whereas the question of the historical authenticity of particular conceptions was not. Thus too Mark was not concerned to recount a miracle as it was recounted to the crowds but to disclose the significance of Jesus to which the miracle can be seen to bear witness. This is the point of the ambiguous emphasis on cleansing. Mark's whole 'narrative' is constructed from this point of view in that it can only be understood from its climax, or rather starting-point, at the resurrection, on the other side of the passion. The fact that the resurrection is the basis of belief in Jesus' messiahship is a theological fact rooted in the historical circumstance that only then could the disciples legitimately and rightly ascribe messiahship

to Jesus. But this will need further exposition as this study progresses.

Suffice it to say that Mark had before him kerygmatic material which asserted Jesus' messiahship. But, in the context of an account of Jesus' historicity in the form of a 'life' of Jesus (i.e. a narrative about Jesus prior to the passion and resurrection), constructed to show the relation between the historical Jesus and the Gospel which proclaimed him, the concept of secrecy was necessary to preserve the kerygmatic stand-point and show the relation and difference between history and the Gospel. Mark's work is not a historical account of the Gospel, but expressly an account of its historical presupposition. This is clear in that the following of Jesus by the crowds does not destroy the secret.

In the debates which follow (ii.1-iii.6), the real dialectic is again between history and the Gospel and the secret is evident in the questioning of the historical Jesus by the scribes and Pharisees. This questioning has its point with regard to the Gospel, as we see from the Son of Man sayings, and probably belongs to the context of the early church's debates with Judaism as well as Jesus' historical difficulties with contemporary religious leaders which is the subject of discussion. The Gospel is seen as giving significance to Jesus' outlook and actions on earth

and also provides the reason for discussing them. Again we have the historical level, and the kerygmatic, with the secret showing the relationship between history and the Gospel with regard to historical Jesus who is proclaimed by the Gospel. The cleansing of the leper fittingly introduces this collection of pericopae since it shows how Jesus' questionable relation to the contemporary cultus witnesses to his significance. In the following pericopae we can see how Jesus' questionableness for the Jewish leaders witnesses to his status, though the fact of his status is concealed from them by the very aspects which the Gospel validates. The history does not openly proclaim the Gospel but is validated in the Gospel and not vice-versa. Mark is not here proving the Gospel to the Jews, but showing the validity of the Gospel message about Jesus with regard to history.

Since Wrede, it has been noted that the first pericope in ii, 1ff. is made up of two parts⁹ ii. 1-5a, 11f. and ii. 5b-10. The basic pericope is a miracle-story into which has been inserted a dispute - 'Streitgespräch'. Apart from the different forms of each section the ground for this is the repetition in VV.5 and 10 of λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ, and the difficulties of connection between VV. 10 and 11. The prior element must be the miracle story, presumably with the statement which goes with it: "arise, take up your

bed, and go home" (V.11, cf. Jn. v.8), since the dispute depends on it for its setting and conclusion. Also the point of the debate depends on the following miracle to complete the argument, and the following miracle is presupposed and anticipated in V.9. But the significance of the resulting pericope lies in the conclusion to the dispute in V.10 and the statement added in V.5b, as the argument in V.9 shows.

The details of the development behind the present structure are in dispute, as well as whether the evangelist has contributed to the development. Burkill¹⁰ thinks that Mark has added the question in V.9 to bring together two statements and point out their respective importance and the relation between them and to emphasize the forgiveness over the act of healing. This is because he disliked the way V.10 emphasized the healing as proof of forgiveness. Burkill therefore rejects Boobyer's view¹¹ that V.10 is a further intrusion of the evangelist addressed to his readers. Hahn¹² thinks that V.5b was part of the earlier pericope, followed by the statement of V.11, since then the inserted debate is intended to defend Jesus' statement on the basis of a connection between forgiveness and healing, so that the healing appears as a proof both of Jesus' authority and of the power of the Son of Man.

It is necessary for the present purpose to discover the point of the pericope in the gospel, and of its present construction, which serves the purposes of the evangelist.

The pericope seems to be part of a complex of material stretching in Mark to iii. 6. Its position in Mark must be connected with the intentions and point of view of the evangelist rather than with the chronology of Jesus' life. This is not the case merely with the apparently open mention of the Son of Man before Caesarea Philippi. That would mean that we had a basically accurate historical account with a few erratic insertions like loose and misplaced boulders which had moved their position on a sloping terrain: in that case they would serve little purpose. But the whole plan of the gospel must be seen as the work of Mark. In any case iii.6 shows signs of previous connection with a passion-narrative. It has been suggested that there was originally a connection with xii.13 because of the parallel mention of the mysterious 'Herodians'.¹³ The original point of the collection may have been to explain why Jesus had been crucified. This would not necessarily be any more historically reliable than the present order of Mark. It is certain, however, that Mark does not see a direct or

immediate historical connection between these debates and the passion, although the passion is clearly in mind at iii.6 as the culmination of Jesus' life and the ultimate confrontation which Jesus apparently lost. But a purely historical connection cannot be intended by Mark here. Seen in historical terms to mention the Son of Man at ii.10, 28 and the passion at iii.6 appears premature. But Mark's concern in the construction of his gospel would seem to be other than the creation of a historical account, and hence he was not concerned with apparent inconsistencies in the narrative.

It is an open question whether the reference to the Son of Man at ii.10 (and 28) is the work of Mark or derives from the collection of debates which he used. Either of the two verses could be subtracted without affecting the connection, and it is almost certain that they were added at some time - although we have mentioned Burkill's contention that V.9 is in fact Mark's addition. Certainly, however, these verses must be taken as of central significance to the pericopae in which they occur, as they appear in Mark.

T8dt noted here¹⁴ a particular usage with regard to Son of Man sayings used with reference to the earthly Jesus,

which differed from that of the 'Q' material. These sayings do not, as those in 'Q', stand in relation to "logia" of Jesus, but they are incorporated into and stand in relation to the narrative tradition of Jesus' deeds. Thus the kerygmatic nature of the narrative tradition as proclaiming Jesus is here in evidence, rather than the reaffirmation and repetition of Jesus' preaching in the preaching of the church about his person, as the continuing guarantor of the truth and relevance of his own preaching - which is, according to Tödt, what we find as the presupposition of the 'Q' material as a body, comprising a collection of Jesus' logia and Son of Man sayings referring to the earthly Jesus. In 'Q', the Son of Man sayings are interpretative in function, in Mark these are kerygmatic. They point outside and beyond the situation of Jesus' life, where they would be hardly appropriate, but are related closely to the historical tradition and expound its relevance.¹⁵ They assert the ultimate challenge of Jesus' person as the cause of his death, from beyond that death, so that from there, his messiahship can really be proclaimed over history, in which he probably did in fact die on the false charge of being a messianic pretender. Afterwards the church was enabled to assert that Jesus is the Messiah,

the Son of Man. This is the situation reflected here and because of this the verses in question do not contradict the secrecy-theme in Mark. In fact in the context of offence and debate, the open proclamation over against history only serves to highlight the secret. Because of the fact that Mark expresses the difference and the relation between history and the Gospel, secrecy and revelation belong together in the context of the kerygma in which Mark writes, and do not represent opposing or inconsistent elements in his gospel¹⁶. That would be the case only if Mark were writing a historical representation of Jesus as Messiah.

Thus this debate, together with those following it, was used by Mark with reference to the relation between history and the Gospel. The offence of Jesus' opponents has the function here of the secrecy-theme elsewhere. The conceptual structure of the debates must be examined to show how this is so.

The literary structure of Mk. ii 1-12 has already been mentioned. In terms of ideas, the notion of forgiving sins is associated with that of healing paralysis so that the former can be presumed in the latter and the latter can guarantee the former. The christological function of the present narrative is plain in the way the two ideas

are brought together in V.9 and associated in V.10 with the person of Jesus as proclaimed by the church and in VV.11f with the healing performed by the historical Jesus. The literary structure, in which the miracle story is prior to the debate, reveals also the conceptual structure, in which the historical healing is presupposed by the argument leading up to V.10. This justified the substitution of the saying in V.5b for that in V.11. The statement of V.10 is supported from history (VV.11f) and from the argument 'a minori ad maius'¹⁷ at V.9. The miracle is the lesser thing in this argument, and what is already assumed, although the harder thing to assert. The weightier point of the argument, and what is disputed, is the ability to forgive sins, which is asserted of Jesus because he had healed a paralytic. The healing of the paralytic is expounded in terms of Jesus' ability to forgive sins, and that ability is proclaimed of him in direct relation to history as Mark understood it. This is the structure of the kerygma in its proclamation of Jesus from the historical tradition and it reinforces Mark's presentation of the relation between history and the Gospel. The structure here is exactly that which we found at i.40ff. Just as Jesus' cleansing of the leper was seen as having wider significance, so it is with Jesus' healing of the

paralytic. The point of the story is christological, as V.10, with V.9, shows, and it ought not to be read historically as an account of the psychological relation between sin and sickness, although the contemporary connection between sin and sickness made possible the construction of the pericope in its present form.¹⁸ Though Schniewind¹⁹ rejects the psychological understanding of the pericope he does not perceive any objection to it on historical grounds because he fails to take the literary structure seriously. But as a historical narrative it reads very strangely, apart from the question of the connection between VV.10 and 11, since it is not clear why the statement in V.5b should have been made to the paralytic at all²⁰, unless merely to score a point! The emphasis seems to be purely christological.

This can be seen from the structure of the argument within the literary structure of the pericope. Within the dispute (VV. 5b-10) Jesus' statement about the forgiveness of sins provokes the reaction of the scribes and leads to a question comparing the statement with the other one in V.11, whereas to declare sins forgiven is the easiest to say, it is not the easiest to prove. The command to get up and walk, however, takes immediate effect and the miracle is therefore used to support the claim made in V.10. The

ambiguity in V.9 is intended and provides the central argument between history - Jesus' miracle - and the Gospel - that Jesus can forgive sins. The miracle story is presupposed in the discussion²¹ but the purpose of the pericope now is to assert Jesus' ability to forgive sins²². The argument moves forward from Jesus' healing of a paralytic in history to the authority of the Son of Man to forgive sins on earth²³ - ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς . The mention of the Son of Man reveals a different dimension but one relevant to earthly existence because of the historical activity of Jesus on earth. The kerygmatic significance of V.10 is preserved by Mark - if the verse is not introduced by him - without breaking the secret involved in Jesus' historical existence, which is the presupposition for this kerygma (thus it is not true that the secret is absent from these conflict-stories as Mark uses them²⁴). In so far as Jesus' rejection in his historicity is reflected in the debates so it is clear that his messiahship, as proclaimed by the kerygma, is concealed by history.

With this approach to Mark's narrative, as a presentation of the relation in the kerygma between history and the Gospel, must be contrasted the view of J. M. Robinson²⁵ that Mark interprets Jesus' life in eschatological terms, rather than as has been asserted earlier in this discussion,

that Jesus' eschatology is interpreted by Mark christologically from the standpoint of the Gospel. Thus Robinson²⁶ speaks of 'the truth of eschatological history in the debates' and an 'ambiguity of a historical situation' resolved by the debates. 'Jesus reduces the confusion (i.e. over the truth of the historical situation which is ambiguous, a confusion caused by the evil intentions of the opposition) to clarity so as to reveal the truth inherent in the historical situation'. This statement parallels an earlier one of Robinson on the exorcism-narratives as an 'affirmation of the presence of eschatology in history.'

Against Robinson it should be said that Mark's concern appears to be christological and to arise from a desire to show the relation between history and the Gospel, not by seeing the Gospel rooted in the history but by showing how the Gospel affects one's judgments about the history itself. Mark's intentions were not to reaffirm history, but to affirm what the Gospel says of Jesus.

Robinson has taken scarcely sufficient note of Wrede and has not taken seriously enough the evangelist's christological concern²⁷. For Robinson the alternatives are either to seek a 'haven of refuge for contemplating eternal truths' or to recognize a 'cosmic struggle taking

place in history'²⁸. It is not clear, however, that these are the alternatives, despite Robinson's strong criticism of the work of H. J. Ebeling²⁹. Robinson's concern with the 'new quest of the historical Jesus' seems to be behind his preference in exegesis for seeing Mark's role as 'historicizer' of the oral tradition and as such dependent on a real history at the centre of Christian theology and at the heart of the kerygma. But this does not exempt one from discovering the kind of relationship between that history and the Gospel disclosed by the kerygma, nor from recognizing the questionable character of the history in itself, when set against the Gospel. Robinson's approach, not surprisingly, leads him to respect the position of Schniewind as the 'best' interpretation of the views of Karl Ludwig Schmidt³⁰. Thus '"the messianic secret" is but an expression of an understanding of history which embraces both the history of Jesus and the history of the church.'³¹.

But this approach ignores investigation of the place of the secrecy-theme in the redaction of the gospel and its implications with regard to the tradition. The theme reflects rather the difficulties of history and the solution of those difficulties in the Gospel. Mark's 'historicization' of the oral tradition recognizes these difficulties of history and

their solution in the Gospel by including the theme of secrecy. History is not ignored, but neither is it presented as other than it is. Thus Mark presents the christological understanding of the kerygma in his use of the title the Son of Man. This term is not 'historicized' by Mark although it interprets Jesus' historical existence and his personal significance. Historically it could only have referred to a future figure other than Jesus himself. Schweizer asserts that originally it was merely a reference by Jesus to himself - if that is linguistically possible. In the latter case, however, it would not have the force and point which it has in Mark. It is with Mark's use of the title that we are concerned, not with a possible different use in Jesus' lifetime³². Schniewind's explanation³³ is that the term was used ambiguously by Jesus and could have been taken either as meaning 'man' generically, or as an indirect christological self-reference by Jesus. This view, like that of Schweizer, faces linguistic difficulties,³⁴ as well as the fact that in Mark the term as applied to Jesus, is clearly kerygmatic and christological and stands over against Jesus' historical situation while depending on it. The debates reflect, therefore, the manner in which the Gospel overcomes the difficulties of history without denying them. This is also the case with the messianic secret.

In ii. 13 ff. the tradition again presents the historical Jesus as the object of offence because of his association with tax-collectors and sinners. His attitude to sinners is shown in V.17 and is justified by the previous kerygmatic statement of V.10. Mark does not repeat a saying like that in 'Q' at Matt. xi.19//Lk.vii.34 about the Son of Man, but he presents the historical presupposition for that saying and has repeated at V.10 the soteriological justification for the fact of Jesus' association with sinners. The following of Jesus referred to in both parts of this pericope (VV. 13f. and 15ff)³⁵ must have been originally the eschatological following of repentance, though the conception develops in a christological direction in connection with the following of Jesus by his disciples (see Mk. x21, 28ff., and viii, 34ff: in Mark the following becomes 'for my sake and the Gospel's - and cf.Mtt. viii,19ff. /Lk. ix. 57ff.). The opposite would presumably be offence at Jesus (cf.Mtt. xi.6/Lk. vii.23). Both offence and 'following' were clearly possibilities in relation to Jesus historically, but their significance is disclosed by the Gospel in terms of Jesus' person and shown to be crucial in the judgment before the Son of Man. (see Mk.viii.38).

The historical Jesus guarantees judgment and salvation in accordance with one's attitude towards him. Both aspects are disclosed by the Gospel. The history itself does not involve the judgment but provides the presupposition for it in the person of Jesus. Historical attitudes to the historical Jesus are given fresh significance on another plane in relation to the Son of Man. The historical relationship with Jesus is not identified with a relationship with the Son of Man, but the two are related through Jesus' person in response to the Gospel. It is the Gospel that gives meaning to offence at and following Jesus (see viii. 35, x. 29). The Gospel proclaims the present significance of the historical Jesus for the future salvation to be brought by the Son of Man. Of course this will be seen later in the gospel to depend on the passion, death, and resurrection of Jesus by which it is possible to call him Messiah and identify him with the Son of Man. This identification was not possible historically, and Mark does not try to argue differently. He depicts the offence and contradiction of Jesus' historicity as an essential aspect of the Gospel itself, as well as insisting that it is this Jesus and no other whom the Gospel proclaims. Jesus' identity for

faith thus depends on his historical identity but goes beyond it. Jesus is preached in the kerygma together with his historicity - hence the form of the pericopae - but Mark's gospel shows that that preaching goes beyond the historical situation itself^{36, 37}. The togetherness - or 'relation' - is within the kerygma itself and not in history - i.e. in the preceding historical situation of Jesus, or a matter of succession. But the preaching of the church presents the real challenge of Jesus now, within history, where we are, together with the historical Jesus, over against the future fulfilment. But this is so only within the preaching and it is outside the history itself - as historical succession. It is not permitted for us to see the historical Jesus as the eschatological Son of Man within history. But in the preaching about Jesus, based on his preaching of the kingdom, we are faced with the eschatological Son of Man himself, and our response is crucial.

Thus it is through the kerygma that the historical Jesus makes possible the forgiveness of sins on earth by the Son of Man, and that Jesus is identified with the Son of Man. This is in a kerygma which belongs after Jesus' earthly life but presupposes that earthly life and proclaims its significance. At the same time the Gospel demands more

than a historical relation to Jesus. Jesus' own eschatological preaching pointed beyond history, and this eschatological challenge is taken up by the Gospel in christological terms as his personal challenge. This is the relevance of the Son of Man title. Mark does not present Jesus 'as the one who acts truly in history' in order to set 'the record straight',³⁸ since the emphasis should not be so much on the period of Jesus' earthly life. Eschatology is not historicized in Mark, but christologized. Fuchs' interpretation of Jesus the Christ as the end of history and of its successive continuity, as standing within it, is to be preferred, because in Mark christological assertions about the person of Jesus are made the answer to the issues both of history and of eschatology. It is in this way that the kerygma proclaims Jesus as the Christ and that Mark presents him as the Christ. Jesus is not presented in Mark as the Christ historically, but the historical Jesus is proclaimed to us, within history, as the Christ, in his ultimate, eschatological demand on men over against history, by the post-resurrection Gospel, in which Jesus is brought in meaningful relation with the Son of Man. Through Jesus also the Son of Man has relevance for us. We know that He can forgive our sins on earth because Jesus, alongside us in

history, healed the paralytic and associated with sinners as his own special mission (ii. 10, 17), although in history he was, and is, exposed to offence as well as to faith. This was his historical mission. It is possible to object, with the scribes, at a man in history declaring sins forgiven (V.7), but this declaration by Jesus is validated by his association with the Son of Man, who can forgive sins by his association with Jesus, who revealed his authority in history by healing the paralytic. We are faced here with that dialectic between history and the Gospel with regard to the person of Jesus which has already been mentioned, and which expounds the eschatological challenge of Jesus from within history - a continuing history - and makes the historical Jesus a proper object of faith and confidence in terms of the Son of Man. Thus even in this pericope, where the Son of Man is proclaimed, we have the messianic secret of the historical Jesus, and the pericope can be seen to fit Mark's plan and justify his treatment of the kerygmatic tradition in its proclamation of Jesus. Mark has emphatically not 'historicized' that kerygmatic tradition as the secrecy-theme shows, but he has shown the nature of its relationship to the historical Jesus. The basis of that relationship is, after all, not historical, but is to be found in the resurrection.

There a real relationship is created and not merely maintained, and the historical is seen on a new level, together with the risen Jesus himself.

The next pericope (ii. 18ff) stresses the break between the present and the period of Jesus' life caused by his death. But it stresses also the import of his presence in history. It does so from a christological point of view, although this is an extension of the eschatological attitude of Jesus during his lifetime. That attitude had caused offence and marked off Jesus and his disciples from their contemporaries, but it is justified by the Gospel, on the basis of a christological understanding of Jesus' identity, in the new emphasis on the person of the bridegroom. The significance of Jesus' person, whether present or absent, is here revealed, in reflection back on to Jesus' lifetime, in the contrast between the eschatological rejoicing of the disciples then and the mourning which followed his departure. The presence of the bridegroom was however historically the secret of Jesus' life and preaching. But this is only made plain in the post-resurrection kerygma. The fasting which followed Jesus' death revealed the christological significance of the eschatological joy of his lifetime. The debate is therefore a christological one

and reflects the messianic secret involved in Jesus' life and death, a secret which, as we shall see, is only revealed to the disciples at the resurrection after Jesus' death. The disciples certainly show no awareness of this here, and the theme of their lack of understanding, concerned with Jesus' messiahship and passion with regard to Jesus' lifetime, will be developed later in the gospel. But the fact of Jesus' death already casts its shadow in Mark (not only at ii.20 but also iii.6) and is clearly regarded as the climax of the debates with scribes and Pharisees, seen in the light of the historical offence of Jesus, which is both set over against and presupposed by the Gospel.

Thus the debates reflect the dialectical relation of history and the Gospel ^{with} regard to Jesus and are therefore part of the theme of secrecy as it appears in Mark's gospel as a whole. Of course the secret extends beyond Jesus' life, as seen from V.20, in the christological fasting of the disciples in his absence and before the parousia. The dialectical relation between history and Gospel, which is christologically based, takes over the eschatological aspect of Jesus' life and teaching. The end of history is expected in Jesus himself, as will be gathered from the Marcan apocalypse. This explains why the Son of Man came to be accepted very early as the most suitable title for

Jesus, and explains its dialectical relation to the historical Jesus at ii.10, 28. The secret allows for the fact that the language of apocalyptic is used in Mark to expound both eschatology and christology in relation to history³⁹. ii.18ff. sees the time of Jesus and that of the church on one plane and understands both christologically, from the standpoint of the Gospel. This understanding will be expounded in terms of apocalyptic. Both history and eschatology are understood christologically from Jesus' presence in history and his later fulfilment of history. There is also a dialectical relation between these two essential aspects of Jesus in the gospel. These two aspects are not confused, either by an eschatological understanding of history, or by a historical understanding of eschatology, because the christological aspect is uppermost in Mark's work. The title Son of Man at ii.10 retains its apocalyptic force and is only related to earthly matters by the historical activity of Jesus. The identity of Jesus with the Son of Man is in the Gospel not in history. In the textual reading which distinguishes Mark from either Matthew or Luke, it is sins ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς which are forgiven, and not the Son of Man ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς who can forgive them. When J.M. Robinson says of ii 13ff.:⁴⁰

"The confusing implications that eating with tax-gatherers and sinners means advocating sin, is clarified as the action of the doctor who is calling sinners (ii.16f). The illustration is not left as a general principle, but rather is focused on the coming of Jesus"; he forgets that even this is a christological judgment made in the context of the kerygma, though dependent on Jesus' historicity. Thus too in ii.18ff. the rejoicing of the disciples is linked with Jesus' historical presence and their subsequent fasting with his departure, but the christological aspect is more important than the historical or the eschatological or any fusion between them.

This interpretation fits the questions surrounding the internal structure of the pericope in its present form, as was the case with ii.1ff. A debate about fasting was at some time extended⁴¹. V.19b provides the link between the original statement of V.19a and the new point in V.20. The mention in V.20 of a subsequent period of fasting does not fit with the original parabolic image of a wedding-feast in V.19a⁴², neither does the new emphasis on the presence or absence of the bridegroom⁴³. The extension in V.20 is two-fold, one in the direction of a stress on the person of the bridegroom, the other towards a differentiation of time between Jesus' life and after.

But the latter is probably the basis for the former. There is a reflection on the importance of Jesus' historicity but not so much on the eschatological nature of the time as on the significance of the person. A change from an eschatological emphasis to a christological one can be discerned⁴⁴. But there is no emphasis on the presence of the 'eschaton' in history in Jesus' person⁴⁵. The Gospel expounds the significance of Jesus within history in terms of a fulfilment still to come, of which he is nevertheless the guarantor. As Nineham says⁴⁶, 'once again the issue turns not on the abstract desirability of some principle or practice, but on the identity of Jesus, and the eschatological character of his coming; it is this the questioners have failed to discern.' The 'eschatological character of his coming' should be seen as guaranteed in his person for the future. Meanwhile there is a period of fasting before the future fulfilment, but it is eschatological, based on a christological understanding of Jesus' person, and as such is not inconsistent with the earlier position but is one with it, resulting from the secret of the Messiah's presence and absence which the Gospel proclaims. Here we have the view of Mark about the origin and basis of the Gospel. VV. 21f about what action

is senseless or appropriate⁴⁷ have their point here from the presence of Jesus in history and what is appropriate in relation to that as its meaning is expounded in the Gospel.

The pattern in these disputes is becoming plain in that the christological implications of Jesus' historical attitude, which was based on an eschatological viewpoint which stood over against history but is now seen to have depended on his own presence within history, are seen be proclaimed by the Gospel in such a way that offence at Jesus is seen as part of the messianic secret of Jesus' life and death and thus that his relation to the apocalyptic Son of Man is also revealed. Our decision with regard to the historical Jesus will be crucial in the judgement. The passion is the ultimate illustration of that, as well as being described as the ultimate confrontation between Jesus and his opponents⁴⁸. The passion is clearly relevant to these debates (iii.6).

A new point at issue appears in ii.23ff. and is continued in iii.1ff. but the pattern is the same. The historical Jesus' action as regards sinners was at issue in the earlier pericopae, whilst here it is his treatment

of the sabbath. His action in each case is soteriological and its significance christological. In each case Jesus causes offence by acting against God's ordinance or infringing His prerogative, whilst virtually laying claim to both. His action allows one to perceive the authority of the Son of Man by which Jesus' action is justified. Jesus affirms the divine prerogative of forgiveness and also declares the original purpose of the sabbath (ii.27). All this has its justification with reference to the expected Son of Man (V.28). The expectation of the Son of Man has too its relevance from association with the historical Jesus. Thus ii.28 belongs to the context of the Gospel and only as such is relevant to the debate it now brings to a close. These Son of Man sayings are not direct references to Jesus but are set over against the tradition about Jesus. The *ἐξουσία* of the Son of Man (ii.10, 28) is seen as the answer to questions about the *ἐξουσία* of Jesus (in i.22, 27 and within the debates themselves). This depends however also on Jesus' historical demonstration of that *ἐξουσία*. Jesus' earthly activity and christological statement are interrelated in the Gospel about Jesus Christ.

In this way we see the function and literary relation

of ii.10, 28 with regard to their context. There is nothing to suggest a secret kept by Jesus himself with the use of an ambiguous self-designation nor an originally non-christological meaning with the sense of 'man' in general. The whole point of the sayings in Mark is christological and their loose connection with the context suggests secondary addition. The reference is clearly to a figure of apocalyptic used with reference to Jesus himself. This is only possible in the context of the post-resurrection Gospel. This explains too the oblique reference to, and indirect identification with, Jesus, in a context describing his earthly life, which the third person maintains. There is no hint of reinterpretation of messiahship in a spiritual direction, nor of the Son of Man concept used in an earthly and historical sense except in so far as both conceptions are brought in relation to the historical Jesus. This relation remains however a questionable one throughout Mark. It does not exist within history, but in the post-resurrection Gospel. Here too is the justification for the relationship posited between Jesus and the Son of Man. That could not be obtained merely from history itself even though it is the historical Jesus who provides the content for the Son of Man expectation and hope of the church, and who thereby guarantees his own

eschatological proclamation. But faith is not put in the historical Jesus as such. There is no external evidence for the Gospel. There is a harder thing to believe than that Jesus performed miracles, and the full implication of those miracles requires the Gospel to expound it. The debates stress Jesus' historical incognito as fundamentally as they stress the issue of Jesus' authority as expounded by the Gospel. Revelation and concealment exist side-by-side, as in Mark's gospel as a whole. That is inevitable in the theme of secrecy and lack of understanding and not the result of an inconsistency in the evangelist's intention. But, as Wrede has insisted, this duality is not explicable historically, but from the juxtaposition of history and Gospel, while against Wrede, it is insisted that the secrecy does not stress the absolute inconsistency of history and Gospel, if it admits their lack of identity. Rather does it insist on the nature of the relationship between them as well as on the incognito of the historical Jesus. The nature of the material reflects its place in the kerygma of the church as well as the character of Jesus' life, and the evangelist has used it to bring out the relationship between that kerygma and Jesus. This is the purpose of his 'historici-

zation' of the kerygmatic tradition: to present it not as a description of Jesus' life but as a description of Jesus' life from the point of view of the kerygma and to show how Jesus can be the subject of that kerygma. The secret was needed to insist on the kerygma as well as to preserve the incognito of the historical Jesus. Both are equally stressed with regard to each other.

H. J. Ebeling failed to see the stress on Jesus' historicity in the secrecy-theme in Mark, a historicity which could, however, only be given its proper significance by the Gospel. But, as against J. M. Robinson, it must be asserted that that significance is not seen in historical terms. The messianic secret was given with the kerygma itself and the meaning of the 'sign' of 'the appearance of Jesus',⁴⁹ needed expounding as soon as Jesus' eschatological proclamation became included in the church's Gospel. But the answer was not for Mark in terms of a 'historicization' of that Gospel but of the dialectical relation between history and the Gospel which the historicity of Jesus makes possible. This is the sole justification for Mark's work in that it preserves the context of the kerygma and also takes account of history, without making a false identification between the two. The link is to be found in the person of Jesus himself,

but only the post-resurrection Gospel could say so.

References for Chapter Two

Section (v)

-
- ¹ see Vincent Taylor, commentary p.185.
- ² op. cit. pp. 44ff.
- ³ see Strathmann in Theologisches Wörterbuch IV μαρτύριον pp. 508-510, cf. Jn. v.45.
- ⁴ see op. cit. p. 157.
- ⁵ cf. Bultmann Das Verhältnis der urchristlichen Christusbotschaft zum historischen Jesus Heidelberg 1962 p.8.
- ⁶ pace Burkill op. cit. pp. 39f., 41.
- ⁷ pace Schniewind, commentary op. cit p.21.
- ⁸ iii. 22ff. will demonstrate that historically the exorcisms are not clear indications of Jesus' status and identity.
- ⁹ see 'Zur Heilung der Gelähmten 6 Mk. ii. 1ff.' Z.N.W. V. 1904, pp. 354ff.
- ¹⁰ op. cit. pp. 131f.
- ¹¹ in H.T.R. XLVII 1954 pp. 115f., see Burkill p.132 n.33.
- ¹² op. cit. p.43 n.1. p.228 n.2.
- ¹³ see T. W. Manson Studies in the Gospels and Epistles Manchester 1962 pp. 43f. from 'The Foundation of the Synoptic Tradition: the Gospel of Mark' 1944, with reference to B.S.Easton Studies in Early Christianity pp. 85ff.
- ¹⁴ see Der Menschensohn pp. 123f.

- ¹⁵cf. Tödt pp. 105ff. Hahn pp. 42f.
- ¹⁶as against Burkill op. cit. p. 129 on this passage, who thinks they do.
- ¹⁷cf. Lohmeyer p.54 and Burkill p.131.
- ¹⁸see Jn. v.14 and cf. Wrede Das Messiasgeheimnis pp. 345f.
- ¹⁹op. cit. p.23.
- ²⁰cf. Wrede Z.N.W. V 1904, p. 358.
- ²¹see Wrede Z.N.W. V 1904 p.358
- ²²Wrede ibid pp. 356f.
- ²³as opposed to the usual Jewish point of view that forgiveness was dispensed by God at the judgment (see Nineham St. Mark p.94.
- ²⁴contrast Nineham St. Mark pp. 89, 106.
- ²⁵Problem of History in Mark pp. 46ff.
- ²⁶ibid p.46.
- ²⁷cf. Hahn's criticism (op. cit. p. 9. n. 1) and also that of Bornkamm (in Bornkamm-Barth-Held Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew London 1962 p.12. n. 4.
- ²⁸ibid p. 50.
- ²⁹ibid pp. 14f.
- ³⁰ibid pp. 13ff.
- ³¹ibid p.13.

- ³² contrast Schweizer op. cit. p. 198 and cf. Vielhauer 'Jesus und der Menschensohn' Z.Th.K. 60, 1963 p.160.
- ³³ op. cit. p.25.
- ³⁴ The difficulty is found in the assumption of an Aramaic original which could mean both the apocalyptic figure, or have a general meaning or imply self-designation. This is unproven and in any case the sense in Mark is quite clearly Jesus as the apocalyptic Son of Man.
- ³⁵ cf. Lohmeyer op. cit. p. 54.
- ³⁶ cf. Fuchs Zur Frage nach dem historischen Jesus Tübingen 1960 'Die der Theologie durch die historisch-kritische Methode auferlegte Besinnung' pp. 219ff., a 'beieinander' - 'relation' - of history and kerygma as against a mere 'nacheinander' - 'succession' - p.236.
- ³⁷ and Eng. Studies of the historical Jesus London 1964. 'The reflection which is imposed on Theology by the historical critical method.' p.46.
- ³⁸ Robinson op.cit. p. 47.
- ³⁹ cf. Hahn op. cit. p. 39 on Mk. xiv. 62.
- ⁴⁰ Robinson op.cit p.46.
- ⁴¹ cf. Lohmeyer op. cit. p.59.
- ⁴² see Lohmeyer p. 59. n. 4.
- ⁴³ see also Erich Grässer Das Problem der Parusieverzögerung in den synoptischen Evangelien und in der Apostelgeschichte Berlin 1957, pp. 44ff and Ineham p.102.
- ⁴⁴ cf. Lohmeyer op. cit. p. 60, Schniewind op.cit p.28.
- ⁴⁵ as Schniewind supposed op.cit p.29.

⁴⁶ St. Mark p.101

⁴⁷ cf. Jeremias Die Gleichnisse Jesu 1960 p.100, Eng.
The Parables of Jesus 1962, p.117.

⁴⁸ cf. viii 38 in its present context, and xiv 62 in its context.

⁴⁹ see Dibelius Jesus London 1963 p.134, cf pp.133-136.

(vi) Reaffirmation of the problem of the historical Jesus, as basic to the Gospel, iii.7ff., 20ff.

The next main pericope - iii.20ff.- stresses the fact that the question of Jesus' authority and identity is raised by the history itself and is involved in his historicity, though not answered by history. This is prepared for by a further reference to exorcisms (VV. 11f), which have already played a significant role. VV. 7ff. also remind us of the general context of Jesus' life and ministry, his healing and exorcism. Behind these lies the identity of Jesus as Son of God (iii.11), which Mark accepts as a description of the historical Jesus but does not admit as a description to be historically discerned. Jesus is not to be, and is not, made known (V.12). The disciples, by whom he will be made known, appear in VV.13ff possessed of two functions: the first is to be with Jesus, and the second is to preach - κηρύσσειν - and to have authority over demons. Both these functions are related to Jesus, the first historically, the second christologically, and this is the link between them. The significance of the disciples in the gospel is made plain in this two-fold function. Their preaching and casting out of demons will be about, and in, the name of Jesus. Their preaching, however, depends on their first

being with him. The break came with Jesus' betrayal and departure, itself brought about by a disciple (V.19).

The issues so far raised in the gospel are collected together in iii.20ff. This is a thematic collection of different items of tradition and deals with the problem of the historical Jesus. The point at issue is the authority and identity of Jesus and it arises primarily out of another dispute with the scribes centred on the question of Jesus' exorcisms. The christological implications of exorcisms are already familiar to readers of the gospel but not to Jesus' contemporaries. Jesus' historical relationship to different groups of people, and their attitudes towards him, are here at issue in a christological context. The way in which the central pericope draws together themes already possessing significance in Mark, and shows their christological importance with regard to the question of the relation between the Gospel and history, is the explanation of its position in the gospel.

V.20 sets the scene and V.21 introduces the question of the offensive aspect of Jesus' historicity and the fact that it is with the historically real Jesus that we are here concerned; VV.22ff. contain the dispute about the

authority by which Jesus casts out demons; and VV.31ff. show Jesus already with an inner group around him and even those historically closest to him excluded. As Lohmeyer¹ says here for the first time in Mark there is a complete concentration on the figure of Jesus, His historical identity is plain, but this on its own is seen to be inadequate.

The Beelzeboul controversy in Mark is different in quite significant respects from the 'Q' version found in Matthew and Luke. As Lohmeyer notes² the initial structure of the argument is different - cf. Mk.iii.23-26 with Mtt. xii.25, 26//Lk. xi. 17, 18. The 'Q' version has an eschatological reference - see Mtt. xii.28/Lk. xi.20 - and raises the general question of exorcisms among the Jews - see Mtt. xii.27/Lk. xi.19. Mark's conclusion raises in return the issue of Jesus' authority using a different version of a 'Q' saying apparently not part of this pericope in 'Q' - cf. Lk. xii.10 and contrast Mtt. xii. 31f. where both versions are given. Probably Matthew follows Mark more closely and Luke follows 'Q' (see also Lk. xi 21f.).

Mark's version, compared with 'Q', shows concern mainly for the christological implications of the controversy. Mark omits the eschatological saying found in Mtt. xii. 28/Lk. xi. 20. Instead he has a saying which

stresses that Jesus' authority is from the holy Spirit and not Beelzeboul, or an unclean spirit (VV.28f., 30). This reveals the implications of offence at the historical activity of Jesus; there will be no forgiveness. The 'Q' version stresses a difference between one's attitude to the Son of Man - i.e., in 'Q', the earthly Jesus - and blasphemy against the holy Spirit - i.e. the Spirit of Jesus in the kerygma. The 'Q' collection is of sayings Jesus used in the service of the kerygma, with a conscious back-reference to the historical Jesus, as their guarantee, in the earthly Son of Man sayings. But there is a difference between the historical Jesus as such and his Spirit in the kerygma of the church³. Mark does not make this distinction here, although he is consciously writing from the standpoint of the kerygma and not in historical terms. He is concerned with Jesus as he is proclaimed in the kerygma, but at the same time with a historical Jesus who is proclaimed in the kerygma. He makes no distinction between the time of Jesus and the time of the church, although he does make a distinction between history and the Gospel. Thus the historical Jesus as such is seen as subject to offence but the Gospel shows us the christological implications of such offence. Mark is not

writing an account of Jesus' life, but showing the relation which exists between the historical Jesus and the Gospel. Therefore there is no description in Mark of Jesus as the Son of Man on earth⁴ in distinction from the kerygma; but the historical Jesus is brought into relation with the Son of Man expectation and vice-versa. Also, Jesus' life is not described in eschatological terms but the significance of Jesus' eschatological preaching is shown in relation to the christological interpretation of the Gospel. Mark writes an account of the historical Jesus to show how one and the same decision has to be made with regard to Jesus and the Gospel in the kerygma. In Mark the historical Jesus and the Gospel are related by the conception of the holy Spirit⁵. The eternal anathema is related to non-perception of the authority of Jesus in rejecting the witness to him of the Spirit. But this is for Mark something brought about by the Gospel with regard to Jesus in the preaching of Jesus in the church kerygma, and not historically visible. But at the same time the Spirit is not separated from the historical Jesus himself. The Spirit is seen as the authority of the historical Jesus, even if not a visible one, and one which demanded secrecy (see Mk. i.10f., 12f., 23f., 34 iii. 11, 22ff., 29f.). This concealment remains in the

preaching of the church before the parousia, but that preaching is then specifically about Jesus and in the power of the holy Spirit. This preaching is also the task of those who do the will of God as the successors of those who surrounded and followed Jesus (see Mk. iii. 14f., 34f.). Jesus is both the revealed, and the concealed, Messiah in the power of the Spirit as proclaimed by the Gospel. Thus there is no distinction in Mark between Jesus and the Spirit, or between the time of Jesus and the time of the Spirit, because Mark's concern is with the crucial challenge of the person of Jesus, present in history and proclaimed by the church which is understood in terms of the divine Spirit. He had, however, first to fulfil his destiny as the suffering and risen Lord and thus become the Son of Man. But the concealed and revealed challenge of Jesus by the Spirit is then seen to be not a matter of history but of the Spirit at work in the kerygma.

The fact that Mark does not refer at iii.28 to the earthly Jesus as the Son of Man despite the evidence of 'Q' for this saying, is significant in view of earlier remarks on ii.10, 28. He makes no use of the characteristic 'Q' material about the earthly Son of Man - although in this pericope he shows knowledge of parallel material

containing such a reference. Thus he does not - as do Matthew and Luke in order to accommodate this material - lay special emphasis on the period of Jesus' earthly life or, refer to his activity as the earthly activity of the Son of Man. He is aware of the difficulties of the Son of Man material and of its primary reference to an apocalyptic figure with whom Jesus is associated in the kerygma. This shows that the earthly Son of Man material, peculiar to 'Q' is special material on its own and is connected with the particular context and purpose of the 'logia' collection of 'Q'.⁶ The christological use of the title, as given to Jesus himself - whatever use he may or may not have made of it himself - appears to belong to the preaching activity of the church and its christological reflection. The difficulties of seeing it, in the varied forms in which it appears in the gospels, as a single conception going back to Jesus himself as a mode of self-designation have been already mentioned in chapter I in the discussion of the work of Wrede and Bultmann. The relation between the future, apocalyptic reference of the title preserved in some sayings, and the direct earthly and historical reference of it to Jesus, found in 'Q', could only be within the context of church christology - this is so even if one aspect is

regarded as authentic for the preaching of Jesus himself. The different references seem, however, explicable from different contexts in church preaching and Mark has concentrated on the apocalyptic reference, the original point of the title, only referring it directly to Jesus by way of the cross and resurrection. The use of 'Q' in Matthew and Luke required a different approach to the title to bring those sayings into relation with the apocalyptic material, and discussion of this belongs to chapters three and four. This relation is, however, only brought about within the framework of those two gospels. Mark gives no hint of how the title might be referred, to Jesus, apart from the particularly Marcan passion and resurrection sayings in the latter half of the gospel, which will be discussed later in their context. It has been shown that ii.10, 28 are again particularly Marcan, a special case, and are not, strictly speaking, earthly Son of Man sayings at all, since, in historical terms, they would have to be taken as references by Jesus to another figure, unlike the 'Q' sayings. Their reference to Jesus is kerygmatic.

There is reflected an actual fact of secrecy about the messiahship of the historical Jesus and his identification

with the expected Son of Man which is admitted by Sjöberg. But this is the result of ascription of messiahship to a crucified man despite that fact, and the identification of the Son of Man with a historical person⁷. This state of affairs is reflected in Mk. viii. 38 - which may be based on an original utterance of Jesus found in 'Q', Lk. xii.8f.⁸ - set over against the question of his messiahship and passion in viii. 27ff., and in xiv. 62 in the same kind of context. The combination of the concepts of Messiah and Son of Man is also plain in xii. 35ff. But this depends on a back-reference to a Jesus who is already believed to be the exalted Lord on the basis of faith in his resurrection after crucifixion. There is no trace of a spiritualization of the concept of messiahship or reinterpretation of the concept of the Son of Man which might have been made by Jesus himself to fit the two together and apply them to himself. This is so even if he preached a coming Son of Man (as Tödt and Hahn think) or used the title as a special mode of self-designation (as E. Schweizer thinks on the basis of the 'Q' material). The factual difficulty of the identification however remains in the Gospel and will remain till the parousia. This fact is reflected throughout Mark and is basic to his christology and his presentation of the

relation between history and the Gospel with regard to the historical Jesus. It is also implicit in the traditional material which he uses, as well as being brought out in his use of the material. The presence of Son of Man sayings in the first half of Mark should have contradicted those who sought a developing self-proclamation - or self-consciousness of Jesus in the text. There is no evidence in Mark of Jesus seeing himself as the Son of Man concealed on earth. Whether this conception appears in Matthew or Luke as a result of their use of the earthly Son of Man sayings in 'Q' will be investigated in the following two chapters.

References for Chapter Two

Section(vi)

- ¹op. cit. p. 82.
- ²op. cit. p. 79.
- ³cf. T8dt op. cit. pp. 110f.
- ⁴cf. T8dt op. cit. pp. 111f. esp. n. 27. *Hahn op. cit. p. 42 with ref. to Mk. ii. 10, 28.*
- ⁵cf. C. K. Barrett The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition London 1947, 1954.
- ⁶cf. T8dt op. cit. pp. 105ff., Hahn op. cit. pp. 42ff.
- ⁷cf. Hahn p. 42 n. 1, ref to Casey JTS NS 9 (1958) p. 265.
- ⁸see T8dt op. cit. pp. 206f.

(vii) The 'parables' of Jesus; Jesus and the
kingdom of God - iv 1-34.

This chapter as we now have it is the construction of the evangelist¹. As Jeremias says, basic to it are three parables - VV. 3ff., 26ff., 30ff., to which were added VV. 10, 13-20 and 33. Mark is probably responsible for VV. 1f., 11f., 21-23, 24f., and 34². As Jeremias says we can discern clearly the various stages in the development of the tradition: Jesus.... the early church.... the evangelist. We can discern too how the kerygma of Jesus became part of the kerygma about Jesus, and was then incorporated into the gospel which looked back to the one through the other and thereby showed the relationship between the Gospel and the historical Jesus.

This development is reflected in the change of sense which has occurred in the point and purpose of the parables. From being stories told to illustrate and explain points, the word 'parable' has come to mean the same as 'masal' in Hebrew, or 'mathla' in Aramaic, i.e. 'riddle'. As such they need explanation, and the explanation is only given to an 'in-group' of disciples. This understanding fits with the gospel's presentation of the historical Jesus using the device of the messianic secret³. The historical secret of Jesus' identity in relation to the Gospel was demonstrated in the

preceding three chapters, with iii.20-35 bringing to a climax both the christological significance of the exorcisms, and the point of the conflict stories. In chapter four Jesus' eschatological preaching is again in question, again bringing in the disciples of Jesus. The interest of the material included consists in its significance for the question of the relation between the Gospel about Jesus and the preaching of the historical Jesus, as already shown at i. 14f. The christological implications of Jesus' parabolic utterances have already been hinted at in iii.23, and the christological importance of the disciples at iii.31ff.

In accordance with Jeremias' analysis of chapter iv the earliest material is in the three parables. These represent the eschatological preaching of Jesus which has been incorporated into a context where the concern is christological. Jesus' earthly preaching was eschatological in that its subject was the near approach of the kingdom of God, demanding a final and unconditional response in the present to that preaching. The nature of this response was crucial for one's standing in that kingdom. This can be discerned in the parable of the sower and Jesus' demand for repentance in i.15.

But this preaching contains awareness that nothing apart from Jesus' preaching gives evidence of the near approach of the kingdom and that decision is to be made on the basis of that preaching alone. The parables argue this case. The improbability of what is asserted in the preaching must not be taken to affect the certainty of its ultimate verification. The outcome will provide that verification. The point of the parables is the relation between Jesus' preaching and what it proclaimed, taking into account the fact that the relation between the two was not apparent⁴. The stress lies on the present acceptance of the demands of the kingdom of God rather than on a description of the relation between the present and the future or of the kingdom itself⁵. The present preaching of Jesus was the sole guarantee of the kingdom. The parables are not about response to God's demands and his coming kingdom in general, but about their relation to Jesus' preaching at that time. The first parable is concerned with that preaching in relation to the varied response it receives, which, it is argued, does not affect the certainty that the right response will find its fulfilment in the kingdom. It is not suggested that the preaching itself is followed by a period of growth

resulting in the kingdom. The emphasis is on argument and exhortation. The connection between Jesus' preaching and the kingdom is by way of man's decision in the present with regard to Jesus' preaching, seen as crucial with regard to that kingdom.

What Mark includes is, therefore, the significance of Jesus' preaching in relation to the kingdom of God and of men's response to it. Part of the presupposition of the Gospel is this historical preaching of Jesus and men's response to it. But its importance is now in terms of Jesus' person and the significance of the response to his preaching reveals the messianic secret.

The earlier redaction of this material, which can be discerned in VV. 10, 13ff., shows that it had already been used in the context of church life with the emphasis on perseverance. The formal pattern of a question by the disciples followed by private instruction shows recognition of the fact that Jesus' sayings and parables require exposition in the context of church life with fresh understanding and application. Catechetical instruction could have provided the setting for this kind of question and answer. But the original meaning and christological implications of the parable are obscured in concern with

a church situation where falling away was common. The resulting differentiation of four kinds of earth misconstrues the original point, causing inconsistency in the original elements of the parable between the significance of the seed, the ground and the crop. This should answer any argument to the effect that the interpretation was merely another use of the parable by Jesus himself.⁶ vii.17ff. In fact shows that the form of the redaction here was a common one in the early church for the application to its own problems of sayings of Jesus⁷.

Mark has taken over the theme of the disciples' questioning of Jesus and made quite different use of it. This can be seen in VV.11f. which are an intrusion masquerading as an answer to the question about the parable of the sower. This parable has become representative of parables generally and of Jesus' preaching in particular. It is seen as describing Jesus' preaching ἐν παραβολαῖς in its effect on the hearers. V.10 has become a question about parables in general and in VV.11f. the word παραβολή is used in a further sense in relation to the ultimate effect of Jesus' preaching⁸. The discussion is not about Jesus' method of teaching in

parables as such. Mark has built upon the disciples' lack of understanding of the parable of the sower in the form of the tradition, and on certain aspects of the sower parable itself. The earlier interpretation of the sower parable had already related Jesus' preaching with the church and this relation has become more important in Mark's further redaction. Secret revelation is said to belong to the church as inheriting the privileges of the disciples.

The concern here is with the relation between Jesus' eschatological preaching and the church kerygma. The 'mystery of the kingdom of God' holds both together, and is what is communicated to Jesus' disciples in the church. What is revealed is the significance of Jesus' person. The questionableness or improbability of Jesus' preaching to which the parables are addressed, is identified as the 'mystery of the kingdom of God' understood in terms of Jesus' preaching of the kingdom of God. This is how VV.11f relate to the parable of the sower.

The mystery is not, however, so much the presence of the kingdom with the person of Jesus during his lifetime as the fact that the kerygma of the church reveals the christological implications of Jesus' preaching of the kingdom of God. VV.11f. do not stress the presence of the

kingdom as such, since this would, in the context of the kerygma, imply later growth. The mystery of the kingdom is rather what the Gospel reveals, from Jesus' preaching, of the significance of his person.

VV. 11f. stress the position of the disciples in relation to this mystery as those who were with Jesus and later preached about him. This, at the same time, stresses the secret in Jesus' lifetime and the disciples' inability to perceive it. At the same time it does not fit with the fact that, during his lifetime, Jesus did not behave in an esoteric manner, as his openness to outcasts shows. This is so even though his attitude to the 'righteous' might suggest a reversal of previous judgments according to a new criterion. VV.11f. cannot therefore refer to Jesus' actual behaviour in teaching during his lifetime but to the ultimate outcome in the Gospel. Jeremias' argument that VV.11f belong to a later period of Jesus' life does not hold, and does not take the significance of their position seriously enough, since the idea that there was a later period in Jesus' life where these verses might have been appropriate is purely an inference from Mark, when Mark himself places these verses earlier! This is the same as the discussion of

ii.10, 28, which cannot be said to be out of place when we have only Mark's order as a guide.

VV.11f. should be taken as referring to the end-result rather than the purpose of Jesus' preaching.

$\nu\alpha$ refers to the fulfilment of prophecy and $\mu\eta\pi\omega\tau\epsilon$ to the effect of Jesus' preaching⁹. They are programmatic in their present position and refer to the ultimate effect of Jesus' preaching. Any other original setting cannot now be conceived. The special teaching of the disciples in VV. 13ff. is the reason for their inclusion here. But this does not avoid the contemporary failure of the disciples to understand. But the verses could have originally referred to the disciples' acceptance in their following of Jesus of the problematical character of Jesus' preaching of the kingdom of God as expressed in the parables¹⁰.

The significance of that preaching is only perceived later in relation of Jesus' person. The whole question of revelation and the relation between the Gospel and Jesus' life and preaching are involved. Jesus' parables look forward to a future revelation based on the present, which will come to those who accept what is given in the

present, whereas VV. 11f look back to what has been received on the basis of acceptance of what Jesus gave. There is a link between the later understanding of the relation between the Gospel and Jesus' preaching and Jesus' understanding of the relation between his present preaching and the future. Jesus had not taught esoterically but as the parables show he had accepted the fact that his preaching appeared to be without foundation but asserted that it would later be justified. This has been reinterpreted in terms of his relation with the Gospel. Hence his preaching can be described as being 'in riddles', on the basis of the parables, and to bear witness to the 'mystery of the kingdom of God.' To be faithful to Jesus' understanding of the relation between present and future, as expressed in the parables, it is incorrect to reinterpret them in terms of the presence of the kingdom with Jesus or in terms of growth, but right to interpret them with regard to the relation between Jesus and the Gospel. Thus the 'mystery of the kingdom' is the christological one of the significance of Jesus' person.

It is the dialectic between history, i.e. Jesus' eschatological preaching in history, and the Gospel that reveals the 'mystery of the kingdom of God.' ¹¹ It is

not something present within history, but it is something implied in Jesus' preaching and which is explicit in the Gospel. The parables were not meant to conceal anything, nor have they a secret meaning¹² but in so far as they presuppose a present concealment over against a future revelation, they can represent the secret of Jesus' person in his preaching as revealed by the Gospel. Mark again finds the basis for the Gospel within Jesus' own life and preaching in the same way as the kingdom is related in the parables to Jesus' preaching. VV. 11f are a demonstration of Loisy's statement that 'Jesus proclaimed the kingdom of God and the church was the result.' This fulfilment of God's rule in the Gospel about Jesus is reflected in Mark and in his doctrine of the secret.

Marxsen is right¹³ that here is no "theory" about parables as such but a reflection of the situation of the evangelist and of the relation between the Gospel about Jesus and Jesus' preaching of the kingdom of God. This means that the secret appears from that relation and that it is therefore a simplification to see the secret present in the history itself.¹⁴ Mark's secrecy-theme is an exposition of the real relation between history and the Gospel with regard to Jesus, and any historical exposition of it is a hypothesis, because it ignores the facts of the relation

between the Gospel and Jesus' life and the circumstances of the creation of the church, as these are reflected in Mark. It also fails to take seriously enough the secrecy with regard to Jesus' historicity.

The nature of the secret is reflected in the collection of sayings in VV. 21ff., which serve to introduce and expound the two concluding parables. These sayings must have programmatic and interpretative significance, since it is not Mark's practice to insert sayings material without its have significance in the plan of his gospel. In the parables which follow, the 'mystery of the kingdom of God' is its relation to the preaching of Jesus. But VV. 21f. assert that what is there hidden will come to light. Jesus preaches the word (see V.14; after that it depends on the hearers (VV. 23ff.)). In the Gospel it is still to Jesus and Jesus' preaching that one must respond, yet in a way not made known to his contemporaries. Even in the Gospel the 'Mystery' remains, but it is a mystery of Jesus himself. The Gospel leads back to Jesus, but by doing so it discloses the secret of his identity. The dialectic between present and future remains in the dialectic between history and the Gospel, and the central point is Jesus himself¹⁵. This means that there is no emphasis on the time of Jesus, but only on Jesus himself. He is both promise and fulfilment, the sole sign of the

kingdom and the point of decision¹⁶. But this is disclosed in and by the Gospel and is not to be seen in the past; it is Jesus himself, the historical Jesus, to whom the "kerygma" now bears witness. But in history his relation to this "kerygma" remains hidden. The relationship is a dialectical one, just as in the parables, between the beginning and the end; there is no growth or prolepsis. There is not even growth from a period of concealment to one of revelation, and Mark is not describing a period of concealment but the relation between history and the Gospel as regards Jesus. It is this relation which involves both concealment and revelation. Both concealment and revelation exist together in relation to Jesus in the Gospel and both depend on Jesus having preached the 'mystery of the kingdom of God.'

This is the mystery which appears in the parables VV. 26ff., 30ff. When these are repeated they stand for the mystery of Jesus preaching, which only the Gospel can expound. These parables appear on two levels since they represent Jesus' actual preaching in history and his relation to the Gospel. They do not assert the actual presence of the kingdom, or of the Gospel, in Jesus' lifetime, or the beginning of either, but the fact that secrecy was

integral to that life and that only later is its nature made plain. What follows depends on what went before. There is a real relation between the Gospel and Jesus' preaching.

An interesting secondary development is discernible in V.29, which must refer to the action of God. This was not the case in the parable, where the man is only incidental to the imagery. V.29 introduces an allegorical element not present in the original parable. This kind of development does not affect the treatment of the parables by Mark, who preserves the contrast between present and future in the parables in the present and past of the Gospel, with probably a glance further forward to the consummation. But Matthew has replaced this parable and VV. 21ff. by xiii. 24ff., which he clearly takes allegorically with reference to the Son of Man and a process reaching from the preaching of Jesus to the parousia - see xiii. 37ff.

For Matthew the parables were 'riddles' - see xiii.10, 13, where there is a 'parable-theory' - whilst for Mark the parables are used to expound the fact that, for outsiders, everything is in riddles, and this covers the whole life of Jesus apart from the Gospel. The term 'riddle' in iv.11 is not for Mark a definition of a parable in itself. But the parable of the sower has become representative of Jesus' preaching, and of his whole activity, in relation to the Gospel (cf. iv. 13). The time of Jesus was the time of

sowing, but, as in the parables themselves where the present time of Jesus' preaching is set against the coming of the kingdom, when placed in relation to the Gospel, it is what has been called a 'punctum mathematicum'. It is a time without definition of its own, which is nevertheless crucial for all time, and is to be used to calculate the ultimate significance of all time. Its eschatological quality is, however, derived from christology, because of one factor; the person of Jesus himself.¹⁷ This is the secret or mystery of the kingdom which the Gospel expounds and reveals as a mystery only to be fully revealed at the last day. This makes it possible to call what the gospel describes as the ἀρχή of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the point of origin and the presupposition of that Gospel, from which it comes and to which it must return in the person of Jesus. This is the relation between the history of Jesus and the Gospel which is expressed by Mark. Because of this relation the whole life of Jesus has become parabolic, in the sense that its full significance is not to be discerned in its surface structure, just as Jesus' parables themselves come to have greater significance subsequently. Yet there is a relation between the surface structure and what is to be discerned beyond it. The two must be held together even

when differentiated. The parables point to the basic situation of Jesus in the eschatological relation between present and future which they describe, and it is this situation which becomes crucial in the relation between history and the Gospel. The 'Zeitverständnis' of Jesus and that of the Gospel are identical and depend on the situation of Jesus. But within this there is a necessary differentiation of times, as well as the fact that the preaching of Jesus himself is different from that of the Gospel, but each depends on, and is related to, the other because of the basic situation of Jesus' himself with regard to both. Thus there is no secret presence of the kingdom¹⁸ or of Jesus' messiahship within history as the explanation of that presence¹⁹ since that understanding of the mystery ignores the differentiation of times witnessed to by the parables. But there is the mystery of the kingdom of God in its relation to Jesus' preaching which becomes the mystery of Jesus' messiahship in the relation between the Gospel and Jesus' preaching. In this way is Jesus the Christ, parabolically²⁰. For this his historicity, and the historicity of his message, are crucial, but they are set against something more, the kingdom itself and the Gospel of Jesus Christ which are not absorbed in his historicity, though he is himself of central

importance to both. The mystery remains mystery even in the Gospel, and it is only disclosed in the dialectical relation between history and Gospel to faith.

Mk. iv. 33f. are constructed to round off the section with a reference back to Jesus' teaching. V.33 seems to be connected with VV. 9 and 14ff and V. 34b seems to refer to Jesus' private teaching of disciples as described in VV. 10, 13ff. V. 34a seems to reflect the idea of the parables as a veiled method of teaching the crowds as opposed to the open manner of teaching the disciples as implied in VV. 11f. The teaching is a summons which is received according to the capacity of the hearers (V. 33b, cf. VV.9 and 23f.).

References for Chapter Two

Section (vii)

- ¹for this view see Jeremias Die Gleichnisse Jesu
Göttingen 1958 pp. 7-9, 12, The parables of Jesus
London 1954 pp. 11ff., 1963, pp. 13ff.
- ²see Jeremias op. cit. p. 8, n.4, Eng. tr. 1954 p.12, n.11,
1963 p.14, n. 11.
- ³Schniewind op. cit p.41.
- ⁴Dahl, 'The Parables of Growth', Studia Theologica
5, 1952 pp. 132 ff.
- ⁵Dahl ibid p. 152.
- ⁶see H. Riesenfeld The Gospel Tradition and its Beginnings
A study in the limits of 'Formgeschichte' London 1957, p.25.
Also found in The Gospels Reconsidered. Oxford 1960. p. 149.
- ⁷cf. Daube The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism. London
1956, pp. 149f.
- ⁸cf. Jeremias op. cit. pp. 7f.
- ⁹cf. Jeremias op. cit. p.11.
- ¹⁰cf. eg Fuchs Zur Frage, 'Das Geschichtsverständnis Jesu
pp. 344f. 357. Eng. trans. Studies 'Jesus' Understanding
of Time' pp. 139f., 149f.

- ¹¹ This dialectic is reflected also in the Literary dialectic of the gospel itself i.e. the reference of kerygmatic material belonging to the Sitz-im-Leben illustrates the point.
- Of the Church to the historical Jesus in a book having the form of a life of Jesus. This doctrine Sitz-im-Leben.*
- ¹² cf. Fuchs Zur Frage p. 346, Eng. tr. p. 140.
- ¹³ Z. Th. K. 52, 1955 pp. 255ff.
- ¹⁴ see Cranfield op. cit. pp. 79, 157f., where we have theological reinterpretation despite the claim to be drawing out what is in the history itself and criticism of a view which sees the secrecy as a 'hypothesis imposed on the tradition by Mark or by the early church.
- ¹⁵ cf. Fuchs Zur Frage pp. 366f., Studies p. 158
- ¹⁶ cf. Kummel Promise and Fulfilment London 1957 p.155
- ¹⁷ cf. on all this Fuchs Zur Frage pp. 365f., 374f., Studies pp. 157f., 164f - 'Jesus' understanding of time.'
- ¹⁸ see Schniewind op. cit. p. 41.
- ¹⁹ cf. Schniewind Nachgelassene Reden p.9; - 'The presence of God's Lordship implies Jesus' secret messiahship.'
- ²⁰ see Barth The Epistle to the Romans Oxford 1933, pp. 96f., 281. Der Römerbrief Munich 1926, pp. 70-73, 263f.

(viii) The historical Jesus and faith, - Mk. iv. 35-vi.6.

In this section there are a number of miracle stories, but Mark's concern is not with miracles as such but with the possibilities of faith in the historical Jesus, just as in the preceding section Mark was not concerned with Jesus' teaching in parables as such, but with the relation between the two situations of the Gospel and the preaching of Jesus. At the same time faith is not required in the historical Jesus as a miracle-worker, or in the miraculous character of Jesus' life. The miracles in this section are incidental to or merely illustrative of the demands of faith in Jesus, and do not themselves demand faith. The miracle stories are parables of faith in Jesus. As Schniewind says¹, the miracles say nothing about Jesus other than what might be said of a prophet or hellenistic preacher. They might even be offensive when posited of Jesus - see vi. 1-6. Yet this shows what is required is faith in Jesus and not in the miracles themselves. The miracles are no difficulty to Mark, whereas faith in Jesus might be difficult. The position is the same as in the preceding section. The miracles illustrate contemporary faith in Jesus and this is now proclaimed in the kerygma where faith in Jesus is required, just as in the preceding section the demands of Jesus in face of the imminence of the kingdom of God were seen as renewed in

the demands made on behalf of Jesus' person by the Gospel. The 'beieinander' of the historical Jesus and the kerygma in the Gospel, and not just a 'nacheinander' is again in evidence².

iv. 35ff. presents the issues of faith and of the identity of Jesus (VV.40f.). It does so in a story about the disciples, saved from drowning whilst with Jesus in a boat. The disciples' lack of faith at the time illustrates the demands of faith in Jesus. Its interest lies beyond the situation itself because the closing question of the disciples is the crucial one which receives no answer in the present context. It is a question which demands the kerygma for an answer, and is the crucial question for this section. The miracle itself is taken for granted, but this only leads to the question. The question is equally plainly about Jesus himself. Whatever answer is given it will have to be about Jesus and be related to the situation described. It will have to explain Jesus' role in the miracle. The Gospel must expound the significance of the historical Jesus as the history itself fails to expound it, but it does so in answer to the questions of history. In so doing it explains the demand for faith in the historical Jesus. Thus 'the healing narratives are not (merely) narratives of healing but are told to illustrate the power of faith which Jesus calls into being'³ and this is true of this

pericope as programmatic for those which follow. The question of faith is the question of christology, that is of the identity of Jesus, which arises out of that of soteriology, that is of the significance of Jesus for faith by which he is experienced as Saviour.⁴ This is why the miracle stories are so important for Mark since they illustrate the christological significance of the question of faith as it arises in the context of miracle. By so doing they also illustrate the relation between history and the Gospel with regard to Jesus. The Gospel reveals the significance of Jesus and demands faith in his person, not in history or miracles. The miracles show how this faith must operate. It operates in relation to Jesus as mediated by the Gospel. It must not depend on miracles. Herein lies the point of the element of secrecy. It consists in the dialectical relation between faith and the historical Jesus as expressed in Mk. iv. 41 in relation to V.40. It is not to hide the earthly activity of the Son of Man⁵ - which would be pointless. It is the existence of any relation between Jesus and the Son of Man which is the explanation of the theme of concealment (see Mk. viii.38).⁶ It is this relation too which is used to explain Jesus' own relation to his proclamation of the kingdom of God. In Mark there is no more a

conception of Jesus as the concealed Son of Man on earth than of a concealed kingdom of God in history. The combination of these two conceptions together as an explanation of the messianic secret in purely historical terms is criticized by Tödt⁷. Christology expounds eschatology by means of the dialectical relation between the Gospel and the historical Jesus. This relation is expounded in this section of the gospel of Mark with regard to the question of faith.

In v.1ff we have another exorcism-narrative in which Jesus' identity is recognized by the demon (V.7). The fact that Jesus is alone probably explains the lack of a command to silence. But Jesus' incognito is preserved here by his very conformity to the image of the Hellenistic exorcist (VV. 14-17). Faith is not a suitable category in an exorcism, but the story draws attention to the power of Jesus to save (VV. 19f). VV.19f. involve personal testimony not evidence of a miracle. Faith can only be a response to that power and not a marvelling at the miracle. The secondary placing of this pericope here is in this case shown by the change from plural to singular between VV. 1 and 2 and cf. VV. 21 and 31.

The identity of the historical Jesus as the one in

whom one must believe is clear here but his very historicity reveals the demands of faith above his historical appearance for his contemporaries. The actual miracles are explicable for the Hellenistic world as for our own in ways which lessen the demands of faith. Faith is not to be faith in a miracle or in Jesus' power to work miracles,⁸ but must be response to Jesus as the awakener of faith, who also answers it⁹. It is this that these miracle stories illustrate. The faith referred to in the two miracle stories of v.21ff. is prior to the actual miracles and related entirely to Jesus' person (see VV. 34, 36). It is this which binds these two stories together. The insertion of one in the other is not for historical reasons since one does not really fill a necessary gap - there is no gap between the ruler's departure and the death of the child which is not filled by the journey itself,¹⁰ or by his conversation with Jesus and the return journey (cf. similarly iii.22ff. and 21, 31ff., and vi. 14ff. and 7-13, 30ff.). The faith of both the woman and Jairus is that of finality, where all else has failed, and against all expectation. The healing of the woman gives no comfort to Jairus. The healing only occurs for those directly involved in the faith-situation (see VV. 31, 40).

To others everything is a riddle (VV.39,40a). The faith is awakened by Jesus and answered by him. Even then the miracle itself must not be discussed (V.43), although it could hardly be hid. It is, however, always possible to take V.39 literally. To tell of the miracle would not make faith unnecessary or provide a short-cut to it, but it might make faith impossible. Faith must be in the impossible and is itself impossible with regard to the possible. There is to be no proclamation of Jesus' miracles. Faith is not asked for in an 'eschatological action constituting the Markan history'¹¹. The structure of faith must be the same now as then, and be related to Jesus himself. This is what constitutes the miracle. Thus there is no point in a secret about the miracles themselves. The point is that miracles must not take the place of faith, to which they bear witness.

Any idea that this part of Mark stresses the miracle-working character of Jesus' life ought to be dispelled by vi. 1-6, which rounds off this section. vi. 1-6 does not belong to the next section as both Lohmeyer¹² and Schniewind think¹³. But there is a lack of historical connection¹⁴ with what precedes. vi. 1 is merely an attempt at connection,

The pericope contains one of the important questions (vi.2) which punctuate Mark's gospel throughout and indicate the point of a particular narrative for the general theme (cf., already, i.27 - based on i.22 -, ii.7, ii.16, ii.18, ii.24, iv.41, and see later viii.27, 29, ix.10, 11, xii.35 (by Jesus), xiv. 61). The question is not merely the result of a natural ('fleshly') acquaintance with Jesus, but is concerned with the historical Jesus as such. It witnesses to offence at the working of miracles by a human person and points to the requirement of faith, without which miracles are not only impossible but meaningless. Jesus' historicity is shown to be ground for offence, but also illustrates the requirements of faith in him. Yet no historical account about him, with or without miracles, will do instead. It is better indeed that miracles are not reported (v.43). Mark clearly believed in the miracles of Jesus, but did not equate that with faith in Jesus. Even he is not reporting Jesus' miracles for their own sake, but to illustrate the demands of faith. His point here is not like that of Matthew (xiii.58)-who simplifies the Marcan secrecy motif here and throughout in a purely historical direction, that Jesus did not, or could not, perform miracles apart from faith - but one concerned with the nature of faith in Jesus as such (see vi.5,6 and VV.2f.).

This is because his concern is with the relation between the Gospel and the historical Jesus and hence in that between faith and the historical Jesus. The nature of the element of secrecy here and in the disputes earlier shows that it is no mere literary device or historical theory but an integral part of the relation described. He is not concerned so much with the contemporary view of Jesus except in so far as it helps to an understanding of faith in Jesus now and as part of that historicity with which we must reckon. This is the heart of the 'scandal' of faith and of the Gospel of Jesus Christ and not the spiritualized version of 'familiarity breeds contempt' seen here by Schniewind¹⁵ and it is the whole point of the Marcan narrative, as well as the explanation of Mark's use of the theme of secrecy. Mark is concerned that the Gospel is about this Jesus and not whether Jesus was historically recognized as Messiah. For Mark it was impossible that he should have been so, adequately, during his lifetime, or should ever be so purely on the basis of history as the secrecy theme shows. 'Scandal' is an essential part of his historical incognito which only the Gospel discloses with full force. Indeed it is precisely this historical, scandalous, and unknown Jesus that is for Mark the Messiah.

It is this Jesus in whom we are called to have faith, not on the basis of the miracles, but just like those whom Jesus healed. It is not even enough to argue, like Burkill, that the idea is that of a period of concealment since, apart from the Gospel, the historical Jesus remains concealed and is seen as concealed apart from faith. This is the case until the parousia (see Mk. viii.38, xiii) and while history lasts. It is the relation between the historical Jesus and the Gospel, in each aspect of concealment and revelation, that is Mark's concern. This is clear in the fact that his narrative is built on a kerygma which combines historical tradition with preaching of the Gospel.

History has, therefore, its place as defining the Jesus in whom one is asked to believe. But it cannot provide external proof for the Gospel nor be used as a support for faith, though it is essential to both. Indeed it is the Gospel which must rescue the history from scandal, and faith which must refuse to be ashamed of the historical Jesus. But history itself involves both for the Gospel, and Jesus' life can only illustrate that fact and the secrecy-theme witnesses to it. Yet it is still insisted that

it is precisely this history with which the Gospel is concerned, and this historical person in whom we are called to have faith, including the scandal and offence. This is also part of the secrecy-theme. There is no Messiah nor Son of Man apart from him and his life and death. The necessity of his death is part of the nature of his relation with the Gospel. Jesus is the servant of the kerygma. This is the doctrine which Mark goes on to expound after the intervening section of the gospel, and it is the basic presupposition of the gospel as a whole. In this sense we have in Mark dogmatic history, i.e dogma and history inseparably intertwined, yet differentiated by the theme of secrecy, which thus guarantees both concealment, as a necessity of the history itself, and revelation, in the person of Jesus Christ as proclaimed by the Gospel. Thus it is wrong to try to isolate the history in the narrative, or to regard its differentiation from the Gospel as a problem, because it is an accepted fact for Mark that history, apart from the Gospel provides no revelation and lies outside the domain of faith¹⁶. To seek to use it as a support for faith or as a corrective, is simply perverse. The implications of Jesus' historical incognito cannot and ought not to be avoided. They are

part of the relationship of faith itself within history.

This is the message of this section of Mark, as is shown by the closing pericope.

Reference for Chapter Two

Section (viii)

- ¹ commentary on Mark, op.cit pp.49f.
- ² again Fuchs Zur Frage p.236 - Studies p.46.
- ³ Willi Marxsen Anfangsprobleme der Christologie Gütersloh 1960 p.42.
- ⁴ This is to be seen also in the basic Son of Man sayings which differentiate between Jesus and the Son of Man, e.g. viii. 38 = Lk. xii.8f. This view of the soteriological basis of the Son of Man sayings was the contribution of Tödt who used it also to differentiate authentic sayings (see Der Menschensohn pp. 207-212).
- ⁵ cf. Lohmeyer Ergänzungsheft to commentary on Mark p.10.
- ⁶ That there is no discoverable concept of a concealed Son of Man on earth in the tradition is also an insight of Tödt - previous note on Tödt.
- ⁷ op.cit. pp. 237-241.
- ⁸ as against Bultmann TWNT 6 p. 206, πιστεύω .
- ⁹ cf. Marxsen Anfangsprobleme, p.42.
- ¹⁰ cf. Lohmeyer op. cit. p.101.
- ¹¹ so Robinson Problem of History p.74.

¹²op.cit. p. 109.

¹³op. cit. pp. 56f.

¹⁴cf. Schniewind op.cit. pp. 56f., Lohmeyer op.cit. p. 109.

¹⁵op. cit. p. 58.

¹⁶Wrede saw the negative historical implications of the secrecy theme, correctly, but not the positive theological necessity of it with regard to history as the presupposition of the Gospel, which is the explanation of the 'narrative' of the Marcan gospel. This is so although Wrede saw the secrecy theme in Mark as a dogmatic and not a historical factor.

(ix) The question of Jesus' identity and his relationship with his disciples. Mk. vi. 7-viii.26.

At vi, 7ff. the 'twelve' appear again after a long absence (since iv. 35ff., if these disciples are the 'twelve' of iii. 14ff.; cf. v.1, 18, 21; vi.1, 7, and contrast v.31, 37) marking a new section of the gospel¹. The 'twelve' are those who were to be with Jesus and to preach (see iii.14f.). In the latter capacity they are the 'apostles'². According to VV.12f. this tradition about the mission of the twelve describes them as continuing the preaching and activity of Jesus. But this depends on their first being with him. This being with Jesus is not yet finished, nor is the disciples' understanding of its significance, nor of the significance of Jesus' message. This will depend on an understanding of Jesus' person based on an understanding of the significance of his life and historical mission. The necessity of this and the disciples' contemporary lack of understanding are reflected in the following pericopae and right up to the end of the gospel. This theme of their lack of understanding supplements the secrecy theme (which is an amalgam of various independent motifs, which together form a constant factor

in the gospel account for a single purpose) in that it contributes to the idea that the Gospel is concerned with the historical Jesus but was not contemporary with Jesus. This was because his historicity involves both concealment and revelation and was, as such, an essential presupposition for the Gospel and the requirements of faith. Central to both is not history but the resurrection. The historical Jesus was of necessity, as well as factually, incognito. It is thus that Mark's gospel presents, in an account of the historical Jesus, the origin, presupposition, and basic structure of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

In vi. 14-16 the question of Jesus' identity appears in terms to be taken up yet again at viii.28 (cf. vi.14f). It also appears in close association with the question of the identity of John the Baptist. This question is associated closely with that of Jesus' identity right at the beginning of the gospel, and will be so again at ix.10ff. Herod's confusion of the two is clearly a mistake, though his association of the two is not. John is of significance for the question of Jesus' identity, though in fact it is John's identity which is decided with reference to that of Jesus, and not vice-versa (see i.2f., 7f., 11, ix.11-13). Jesus is here the unknown

quantity, though his identity is apparently settled with reference to John. But Herod did not perceive John's identity, and could only do so if he had first perceived that of Jesus. Basic to the Gospel is the question of the identity of both, but the primary question is that of Jesus' identity, which was not historically visible, and as such involved John in equal secrecy. John's death is a result of this and a foreshadowing of that of Jesus himself (see ix.11-13). But it is Jesus, and not John, who will be raised from the dead. The mighty works of Jesus (vi.14) reveal the preeminence of Jesus, since clearly John did not do them in life (cf. Jn. x.41 - note the difference that they are questionable *δυνάμεις* for Mark, not *σημεῖα* . Only the resurrection of Jesus will be the point where his identity and that of John can both be proclaimed. Then it will be seen that Jesus' identity is crucial. The parallelism of vocabulary is probably significant for contrast and comparison - cf. vi. 16 and xvi.6, *ἡγήσθη* ; vi.29 and xv. 45f., *πῶς* AND *μνημεῖον* ; and, possibly, vi.29 and xvi.1, *αὐτό* AND *αὐτόν* . The account of John's death is certainly placed here for that purpose and does not really provide any interlude before the disciples' return at vi.30, nor is it the ground, as

in Matthew (see Mtt. xiv. 12f.), for the subsequent departure to a desert (mk. vi.31). Its point is christological, as is the case with the whole of the Marcan 'history'. The history is parabolic, and not possessing signs as in the Fourth Gospel - compare the question of Jesus' miracles as against the witness of John in the references above.

The return of the disciples, retreat to a desert-place, and the first feeding miracle appear in vi.30ff. The miracle is not stressed here as such³, but its significance for Mark will appear later. There is no suggestion of an eschatological sacrament. A real feeding is intended.

The point of the feeding is prepared for in vi.45ff., see vi. 52. The secondary literary construction involved is in this case shown by the geographical confusion between VV.45 and 53, cf. viii. 22. This supports the observation that Mark has doubled various pericopae in this section. But his motives are theological rather than historical, and he is only bringing out aspects of the kerygma and not altering a basic historical source. The place names are at random in the tradition and cannot be used as the basis for historical reconstruction, even if it were desirable or necessary. It will be shown that viii. 11ff. is a

secondary construction to bring out the significance of the two feeding miracles, and vi.52 is a forward reference to that. This verse is linked with vi.47ff. which has been placed here also to point to the christological implications of the preceding feeding miracle. This may itself be a construction out of two traditions, the one an account of the stilling of a storm and the other an epiphany story⁴. There are clear affinities with iv. 35ff. The basic difference here, of course, is Jesus' walking on the sea and the fact that in this pericope he is at first an unknown phantom and later disclosed as his normal self. With this self-disclosure both the disciples and the sea are calmed, but the disciples do not perceive who he is. Jesus' normal self gets in the way, as at iv. 35ff (see V.41). The stilling of the storm is, however, linked with Jesus' self-disclosure. The disciples' lack of understanding - linked with that with regard to the feeding miracles in V.52, although only viii.11ff. really explains this note - is therefore shown to be christological and to witness to his historical incognito. This is the point to be

developed in this section. But it is equally clear that Jesus' historical identity is also stressed. Faith in Jesus will not be based on history, but will be faith in the historical Jesus, after he has himself ceased to be historical. The point of the construction of this section becomes clear when this point is perceived. Jesus' historical relations with his disciples are important from this point of view, and reflect it throughout the remainder of the gospel.

This understanding of the structure and contents of this part of Mark, as of the rest, is contrary to that of Lohmeyer, who gives a name to a whole tradition of gospel interpretation which the conservatives have taken over from the liberals in an altered form, i.e. to see the gospels as witnesses to the historical life of the Christ and the latter as being what matters. As against that, this understanding seeks to give authority back to the gospels themselves as expositions of the Gospel about Jesus Christ, based on the resurrection, and to see Mark, as well

as John, as denying the validity of that approach which puts emphasis on the life of Jesus in itself. Lohmeyer⁵ speaks of the earthly activity of the Son of Man as the basis of the Marcan account here. It may be true that the historical Jesus is to be seen as the Son of Man, though he is historically differentiated from him. This differentiation in history is maintained by Mark, and the predictions of the passion (e.g. viii.31) support this rather than deny it, because they are veiled statements of Christian apocalypticists, not historically understandable, and, placed where they are, 'vaticinia ex eventu.' There is no support in Mark for Lohmeyer's assertion that behind Mark's account there is a narrative about Jesus' life as the earthly activity of the Son of Man, even as concealed activity. Rather is the kerygma of the Son of Man set against the historical activity of Jesus. Here too Mark is not concerned with history, but with the christological relation between history and kerygma. The quasi-biographical form of the gospel is derived from the kerygma and identifies the common denominator of history and Gospel, Jesus of Nazareth. The disciples' lack of understanding shows the way the two are related to that common denominator, who is proclaimed by the Gospel in a way not evident to his disciples

in his lifetime. Mark shows no inclination to get round this fact by the notion of the concealed earthly activity of the Son of Man. Rather does he set history and the Gospel, Jesus and the Son of Man, over against one another, as at viii. 38. History and the Gospel are not equated by the form of Mark's work because of the very themes of secrecy and lack of understanding, and Mark, whilst clearly believing that what he describes, including the miracles, actually took place, does not present us with the historical facts themselves. Without the kerygma, based on the faith in Jesus which arose from the resurrection, the history cannot speak, neither can Jesus' identity be discerned. This is so even if it was suggested that he might be the Messiah (viii.29f.). The crowds who recognized and thronged Jesus in his lifetime (vi. 54ff.) and sought healing from touching him only prefigure the later recognition of him by faith as Saviour, which is made possible by the Gospel. His historical availability to our faith is only properly and fully expounded by the Gospel of the resurrection, which also reveals the limitation of his historical contingency as such.

vii. 1ff. would seem to owe its presence here to a number of factors. In V. 2 there is the catch-word ἀποτός , cf. vii. 38, 41, 44, 52, vii.27 and viii.14ff. The question about eating and defilement has a connection with

that of Gentiles - cf. vii. 24ff. The dispute with Pharisees and scribes prepares for that of viii 11ff. The theme of private instruction of disciples (VV. 17ff note the word παραβολήν V.17) is suitable to the section and is a basic scheme of Mark's gospel, although the disciples fail to understand. The differentiation between the inner reality and the outer appearance may also have its own interest with regard to the christological theme of the section.

The frustration of Jesus' attempt to remain hidden in Gentile territory, which is the point of the next pericope (see vii.24), shows that, although Jesus' earthly ministry was almost entirely to the Jews, he is also the Saviour of all who approach him (vii.1ff. shows) that he rose above all taboos and traditions. The departure of Jesus is not to be explained here in Mark historically, as an attempt to escape Herod.

vii.32ff. is the first of two pericopae which have symbolic significance - the other being viii.22ff. It is also notable for the command to silence in V.36, which is followed by a general statement that such commands were broken in inverse proportion to their stringency. This

would appear to be an editorial note to a redactional addition which certainly has no effect in the narrative. What Jesus has done is linked with a prophetic expectation (V.37). All the more remarkable is the fact that Jesus' identity is not perceived. Historically the secret is useless, yet it stands over against the history as a whole. This passage might be compared with i.40ff.

viii. 1ff contains the second feeding miracle, which is taken up in VV. 14ff. This passage, beginning at V.11, provides the point of the whole section and is linked with the earlier part of the section by vi.52. It brings together two themes, the refusal of signs and the disciples' lack of understanding, in a christological context. These two themes combine both aspects of the theme of secrecy in the gospel and show that it has the function of differentiating history from the Gospel with regard to the person of Jesus. The passage also shows the connection between the secrecy theme and the disputes with the scribes and Pharisees. In Jesus' lifetime there were no signs and Jesus' identity was not perceived. This was in spite of miracles and eschatological preaching. It shows that the theme of secrecy with regard to miracles records the fact that the miracles were not signs, although they could not

be concealed. They did not reduce, but contributed to, the offence at Jesus' person. Even the disciples did not draw from them any lesson. The secret was clearly not a historical factor but covers history as such. Jesus' life was a riddle. The disciples in this passage (V.18) were in the same position historically as 'those without' (iv.12). The nature of the historical Jesus is as much a secret of history now as then, if we look to history for guidance. Yet it is that Jesus in whom we are to believe and whom the Gospel proclaims. The secret is involved in this dialectic between history and the Gospel with regard to Jesus. It cannot be explained as a factor within history itself, but rather of history itself. With this passage we are presented with the problem of the historical Jesus which is at the root of the Gospel, at the end of the first part of Mark. The second will explain the problem in terms of the necessity of the passion as something which cast a veil even over the conception of Jesus' messiahship itself when the disciples thought of it. Therefore their lack of understanding extends to the very end. Even when they thought of Jesus as the Messiah history cheated them. Yet for Mark it is precisely this Jesus whom the Gospel can proclaim as the Messiah and Son of Man. Herein lies the secret of his messiahship and the continuing scandal of Jesus'

historicity, whether as miracle-worker, messianic-pretender, eschatological preacher, or crucified criminal. The secret is inescapable in history itself, yet this is the basis of the Gospel.

Analysis of Mk.viii.11ff. shows how the evangelist has constructed it to bring the preceding part of the gospel to a climax in preparation for an investigation of the precise nature of the secret of Jesus' historical messiahship in the concluding part leading to the passion. The general problem is posed first. vii.11f. is recognizably parallel to 'Q' material - see Mtt. xii.38f., Lk.xi.29, cf. xi.16 - which belongs in 'Q' to a different context and which Matthew and Luke have used differently. Mark's version includes a bare refusal of a sign to 'this generation', whereas 'Q' mentions the 'sign of Jonah.' We can also compare Mtt. xvi. 2f and Lk. xii. 54-56, about failure to perceive the 'signs of the times.' Mark never calls the miracles 'signs' (σημεῖα), but 'mighty works' (δυνάμεις) - see vi. 2,5,14. They are also used symbolically to show the nature of faith in Jesus and its relationship to history. They represent the historical approach to the question of Jesus' identity which on its own, is futile, and

are not to be regarded as evidence of his identity. It is forbidden to speak of them. Faith alone is required. Although there are miracles, there are no signs - this is similar to the Fourth Gospel's presentation of unperceived signs. In Mark 'signs' are either the work of prophets (xiii.22) in order to deceive or connected with apocalyptic events (xiii.4). The original point of the request for signs may have been eschatological and a mark of refusal to accept Jesus' eschatological preaching of repentance - see the 'sign of Jonah' in 'Q'. But here it has come to have christological significance, as also in 'Q' where the 'Son of Man' is the sign for 'this generation' (see Lk.xi.30) i.e. the historical Jesus who proclaims the kingdom of God. For Mark this identity of Jesus is a secret of history for which there is no sign in history. In 'Q' the 'Son of Man' always stands over against men in history as the rejected one in the person of Jesus. In Jesus, who is rejected, the power of the Son of Man is not perceived and in Jesus he is an outcast. This is the same in the disputes with the Pharisees in Mark where Jesus' miracles reveal the power of the Son of Man, but he is himself an object of offence (see ii.1ff., 23ff.). The miracles are not signs for 'this generation', even when they occur.

The disciples' lack of understanding is linked by Mark with this refusal of signs by an obviously secondary and redactional device. The scene is set by the disciples' failure to bring with them on the boat more than one loaf. This is followed by a curious saying, originally independent (see Lk. xii.1), of doubtful meaning (see Mtt. xvi.12, Lk. xii.1, where attempts are made to give it a precise meaning). The precise meaning does not concern Mark who merely uses it to fulfil a parabolic function, in line with his use of the concept of 'parables' (see Mk. iv. 11; vii.17f.), using the situation and the idea of bread (see Mk. vii.16), to link the Pharisees' request for a sign and the disciples' lack of understanding of the feeding miracles, of which their lack of understanding of the saying which is never explained is taken to be a symptom (vv. 17ff.). The connection of vi.52 with the preceding pericope shows that the point is christological. The artificiality of the connection between the parts of the present passage shows that it is purely thematic and constructed for the purpose of the evangelist. The word ἀπτοῦς is a catchword throughout this section and is associated with the idea of Jesus as the one who answers man's need (cf. vii.27). The particular saying around which the

passage hangs together (V.15) has no particular significance of its own, but has a functional position in the passage. Matthew's treatment of it is secondary and reduces the significance of this Marcan passage on to a historical level (see Mtt. xvi. 6ff.). In Mark it is associated with the lack of signs to 'this generation' and the parabolic nature of Jesus' life which makes it impossible, without the revelation of the Gospel, to perceive the significance of Jesus' person. Thus it illustrates the contemporary blindness of the disciples (VV. 17ff). This use of a dark saying to illustrate a point about perception of Jesus' identity, even given the history which is illuminated by the Gospel, is almost Johannine. The stress on the two feedings found in Mark relates both to the certainty of Jesus' being able to answer need and accentuates the disciples' lack of perception.

Linking on this section with the next is the second symbolic healing - viii.22ff., cf. vii. 32ff. Their symbolic function is shown by reference to viii.18, and they reveal Jesus himself as the one who must open blind eyes and deaf ears. But this will be a private self-disclosure away from the world at large - VV. 23, 26. Historically it is nonsense to forbid a man to re-enter

the village and yet return home.⁶ This may account for the variation in the African text, which Lohmeyer prefers⁷. But Mark is not interested in the historical difficulty of the command.

References for Chapter Two

Section (ix)

- ¹ see Lohmeyer op.cit. p.109.
- ² cf Rengstorff TWNT I pp. 429, 431f., ἀπόστολος .
- ³ see Lohmeyer op.cit. p. 128.
- ⁴ see Lohmeyer op. cit. pp. 130ff. and Ergänzungsheft p.12.
- ⁵ op.cit. pp. 135f.
- ⁶ ~~op. cit. p. 159 n.5.~~ cf. Wrede Das Messiasgeheimnis p.134.
- ⁷ op. cit. p. 159 n.5.

- (x) The secret of Jesus' messiahship and passion as the basis of the Gospel of Jesus Christ - viii. 27 - ix. 13.

In this section Mk. vi. 14f. is taken up again - viii. 28 - but carried further with the theory of the disciples, or of Peter, that Jesus is the Messiah - V.29. This is neither contradicted nor affirmed by the command to silence in v.30, but it is to be understood in relation with other such commands after miracles as an indication that something is inappropriate or unhelpful in the context of Jesus' earthly life. Jesus is not to be hailed in history as a miracle-worker or as Messiah. The reasons for this are advanced in the rest of this section of the gospel. Indeed, when this passage is compared with the Matthaean version (see Mtt. xvi. 17ff.), it is difficult not to see V.30 as a rejection of the title Messiah by Jesus¹. This would be even more striking if Bultmann is right that Matthew's version is the earlier one and originally a resurrection narrative. Mark would then have shown awareness that the confession here was premature. More likely, however, the passage represents a historical repudiation by Jesus of the title Messiah which Mark has modified - see discussion below. Different versions are clearly in evidence, but

the purpose of that in Mark is plain. It is to show that Jesus could not be proclaimed adequately as Messiah during his lifetime, and that historically the conception, when applied to Jesus, is even false. Jesus was no more historically the Messiah than the miracles were historical 'signs'.

It is hardly right, with Lohmeyer², to connect V. 30 with what follows rather than with what precedes. This would be contrary to Mark's usual practice. V. 31 in any case appears as a fresh beginning and something asserted boldly (V.32a, *παρηγοῖα*). V. 31 is not the content of the secret, but rather its explanation. Jesus will be seen to be the Messiah, but as the Son of Man who has first to suffer, die, and rise again. This is what the disciples did not understand when they thought of Jesus as Messiah during his lifetime (VV. 32f.). V. 31 would seem to be a statement about the Son of Man which associated him with the crucified and resurrected Jesus, after the event. This is taken as the explanation of Jesus' refusal to accept the title Messiah on earth as well as of how he really was the Messiah in a new sense (cf. Mk. xii. 35ff.) V. 31 does not then express the secret that Jesus was the earthly and concealed Son of Man,³ but is a development of the dialectical relationship between Jesus and the Son of Man as expressed at V.38. Thus the secret of Jesus'

messiahship is expounded in terms of a concealed pre-existence of the Son of Man understood with reference to Jesus of Nazareth. The passion provides the link between Jesus and the Son of Man, and also explains the secret of Jesus' messiahship. But this was itself something which was not understood by the disciples during Jesus' life. This is not surprising since Jesus' actions which lead to the passion, and the passion itself were historically contrary to messiahship. Any historical ascription of messiahship to Jesus could only have been a misunderstanding. For Mark, any messianic self-consciousness on Jesus' part must have taken the passion into account as part of his becoming the kind of heavenly Messiah which would identify him with the Son of Man (cf. xii.35ff. and xiv. 61f.). In this way the secret of his messiahship and the secret of the passion are the same, and both part of the secret of his identification with the Son of Man. In Mark Jesus was not the Messiah, because his messiahship is a secret of history over against the Gospel. Jesus repudiated messiahship on earth (xii.35ff.) and differentiated himself from the Son of Man (viii 38). But this is understood in terms of the passion. The dialectic between history and Gospel appears here in the dialectic between

Jesus of Nazareth and the Son of Man as the explanation of the secret of Jesus' messiahship. The presupposition of this dialectic is the passion and resurrection of Jesus, which can now be described as the passion and resurrection of the Son of Man.

The above is an analysis of the historical and theological presuppositions for the construction of this passage of Mark. The passage itself is constructed out of various material, and is incapable of a historical explanation. But it sets the historical question of Jesus' messiahship, over against that understanding of Jesus' messiahship which is possible from the post-resurrection Gospel. V. 28 is constructed on the basis of material found at vi. 15f; V. 30 is typically Marcan; and V. 31 is one of a group of three Son of Man sayings (see also Mk. ix. 31, x 33f.) which are peculiar to Mark and integral to the scheme and structure of Mark's gospel. These Son of Man sayings have an individual and secondary nature and character and seem to depend on the previous identification of Jesus with the Son of Man on the basis of the passion. The passage, as constructed, serves an obvious function in introducing the final part of the gospel leading to the passion to show how the passion relates

to the Gospel of Jesus Christ and how that Gospel is concerned with the historical Jesus and the question of his messiahship.

On the basis of the above differentiation of secondary elements there is a residue of material which may be an authentic tradition. Hahn⁴ has in fact claimed that VV. 27a, 29b, and 33 form a separate and independent tradition, on the basis of which Mark has constructed the passage in question. This would show that Mark had modified a tradition in which Jesus rejected a messianic temptation to set this rejection in the light of the Gospel, which could only proclaim Jesus' messiahship on the basis of his passion and resurrection. The command to silence, which is a Marcan addition can then be seen to have the function of showing that the basis of the kerygma lies in the Gospel but not in the history, yet that the Gospel presupposes the history in question (V.31). The disciples' mistake is then reinterpreted as a premature and inadequate understanding of Jesus' messiahship, which did not take account of the passion.

viii. 31 describes the historical presupposition for the Gospel in that before Jesus can be properly proclaimed as Messiah in terms of the Son of Man he must die and rise

from the dead. The saying is one of several in Mark which must have been originally sayings of Christian apocalypticists. These are condensed forms of the argument of this part of Mark's gospel and as such are used by him as summaries of that argument and as the content of what the disciples failed to understand during Jesus' lifetime. viii.31 is representative of a tradition of interpretation of the scriptures and the facts of Jesus' life in support of the view that Jesus is the Son of Man who had first to suffer, die and rise again, hence he could not be the typical kind of historical Messiah. This tradition is traceable in various parts of Mark, and other parts of the New Testament. The passion of the Son of Man is described at Mk. ix. 12, xiv. 21, 49 as being in accordance with the scriptures. If we ask what text is in mind we must look at Mk. xii. 10, where Ps. cxviii. 22 is quoted, and note the use of the verb ἀπεδοικίμασαν, cf. ἀποδοικίμασθῆναι in vii.31. In Acts. iv 11, in the same quotation, the verb used is ἐξουδενηθεῖς, which is the same verb as that used at Mk.ix. 12b - ἐξουδενηθῇ. Thus Mk.viii.31 and ix. 12b clearly depend on two different Greek versions or translations of the same text⁵. The δεῖ in viii.31

is probably the equivalent of *καθὼς γέγραπται*, cf. ix. 12b and xiv. 21. Lohmeyer interpreted the *δεῖ* as having apocalyptic or eschatological force⁶. But its additional force here in Mark, over and above scriptural necessity, probably comes from the given historical fact of Jesus' crucifixion, death, and resurrection, which is a presupposition of the Gospel of the Son of Man. This at least explains the position of the saying at this point in the gospel. In each case suffering is combined with the concept of rejection, and the passion tradition is combined with the Son of Man expectation⁷ to show how Jesus who suffered and died, rejected by his contemporaries, fulfils thereby his messiahship and the Son of Man expectation. This combination has been schematized in Luke, as can be seen by the addition by Luke at xvii.25 in a 'Q' context of a saying dependent on the Marcan used at Lk. ix.22.

VV. 34ff. show that Jesus' calling to the disciples to follow him is also to be understood afresh in the light of the cross. Salvation is achieved by sacrifice for the sake of Jesus and the Gospel (V.35). One's shame at the crucifixion of Jesus will result in the Son of Man being ashamed at oneself at the judgement (V.38). This verse shows the way the Son of Man expectation is related to the

historical Jesus. The two are not identified historically but are inseparably related. Basic to the Gospel is the historical incognito of Jesus (cf. I Cor. i.18-ii.9). The point of vii.38 is that Jesus and the Son of Man have been identified beyond the crucifixion and resurrection, as V.31 shows. But it shows too that the earliest Son of Man sayings differentiated between the Son of Man and the historical Jesus, or placed them in a dialectical relation to each other. This is a further indication of the nature of the motif of secrecy as referring to the difference between Jesus in history and Jesus as he is proclaimed by the kerygma, and yet insisting on their identity in that the kerygma showed the significance of the historical Jesus and of one's attitude to him.

This theme is continued in the following passage. As Bultmann has shown⁸, Mark has inserted the tradition of the transfiguration of Jesus (ix.2-8), to which he has added two connecting verses of his own (VV. 9f.), into another tradition, ix.1, 11-13⁹. This other tradition reasserted the eschatological expectation of Jesus against scribal criticism that Elijah must come first, on the grounds that he had already come, with John the Baptist.

According to Bultmann, V.12b, with its reference to the Son of Man, is an interpolation in the text of Mark¹⁰. More likely it is, as Hahn asserts, an addition of the evangelist, in line with his addition of VV. 2-10.¹¹ Just as Elijah was already there, so was the Son of Man, in accordance with the post-resurrection preaching of Jesus¹² Conzelmann¹³ who also takes this view of ix.1, 11-13, sees Mark carrying further the guarantee of John and Jesus in connecting the resurrection with the parousia. Also a differentiation is made between the kerygma in the days of Jesus and now, in that Jesus spoke of the kingdom quite openly (ix.1), but not of himself. It is now possible to speak of him as the guarantee of the kingdom (ix. 9f. added to the account of the transfiguration). This introduces the theme of the messianic secret. The disciples too did not understand Jesus' own relation to eschatology until the resurrection. Thus in Mark the commands to silence over Jesus' messiahship are always linked with the disciples' lack of understanding (cf. viii. 27ff., despite the fact that there the disciples raise the question of Jesus' messiahship). This shows that the theme is schematic in Mark's account of the relation between Gospel now and the historical Jesus then. The dividing line between them is explicitly the resurrection. There is for Mark no direct

relationship between them, but the Gospel presupposes the history of Jesus and the history of Jesus finds its explanation in the Gospel. This is the point of ix. 1-13 in Mark.

The account of the transfiguration in Mark has therefore the functions of introducing reflection back on Jesus from the view point of the Gospel, which is based on the resurrection-faith and belief in Jesus as the Son of Man who guarantees the fulfilment of eschatology, and of showing that this is the standpoint of the Gospel, which has, nevertheless, its point of origin in the historical Jesus. The theme of secrecy in both its aspects of secrecy and lack of understanding, is then clearly seen, as used by Mark, to have the function of describing the nature of the relationship between the Gospel and the historical Jesus. Also the passion and resurrection are clearly shown to represent the necessary dividing line between the two. The passage then shows the point of discussion of Jesus' messiahship in viii.27ff. This is not to say that the transfiguration narrative was originally a resurrection narrative, since this is not possible on form critical grounds, and because it is quite unlike any account of the risen Jesus in the gospels. But it is to

say that, according to Mark, the narrative could only be formed after the resurrection and from the identification of Jesus with the coming Son of Man. Thus resurrection and parousia are linked together, and together provide confirmation in terms of Jesus' person of the eschatological expectation of ix 1. He will come again, who has already come. ix. 12b, together with ix. 9, shows the point for Mark of linking the Son of Man with the passion and resurrection of Jesus since the passion and resurrection of Jesus are the basis of identification between Jesus and the expected Son of Man, as well as the basis of understanding his messiahship.¹⁴ The linking is also important as a further guarantee of Jesus' eschatology, whereas originally the passion seemed to be the deathblow both to eschatological expectation and Jesus' messiahship. But, on the basis of the resurrection, it is now possible to see the earthly Jesus as the Son of God (ix.7). The passion of Jesus becomes also understandably the touchstone for acceptance by the Son of Man (viii.38).

On the transfiguration narrative itself it must be noted that Mark probably thought of the event as an event of Jesus' lifetime, but one which could not then be understood

or adequately proclaimed. Its intrusion here is not in order to stress it as a particular event in Jesus' lifetime, but to show how the Gospel is related to the historical Jesus. This is done by means of the interpretative concept of the Son of Man, related to Jesus as he is known after the passion on the basis of the resurrection. The splitting up of the two aspects in VV. 9b and 12b shows their respective functions in viii. 31. Hahn¹⁵ sees the narrative as originally about Jesus as the eschatological prophet (VV. 3-5), expanded in Hellenistic circles to one about Jesus as the Son of God - like the account of the baptism of Jesus. VV. 2 and 6 represent Mark's own interests with regard to secrecy and lack of understanding. V.6 refers to both VV. 5 or 7 and sets them against each other, as well as linking the account with VV. 9f. With this understanding of the redactional construction of this section of Mark the main thesis of the evangelist in the gospel is plain, together with the hermeneutical function of the themes of secrecy and lack of understanding with regard to Jesus messiahship.

References for Chapter Two.

Section (x)

- ¹cf. Wrede op. cit. pp. 117f and Gloege op. cit. pp. 226f.
- ²op. cit. p. 165.
- ³cf. Lohmeyer op.cit. p. 164.
- ⁴op. cit. pp. 226-230.
- ⁵for this argument see Tödt op. cit. pp. 150-157, 174-178, referring to Lohmeyer, and to Michaelis - TWNT V πάσχω, pp. 913ff., and, also, Hahn op. cit. pp. 50-52.
- ⁶see his commentary, op. cit. pp. 164ff.
- ⁷see Tödt op. cit. p. 201.
- ⁸see Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition pp. 131f., History of the Synoptic Tradition pp. 124f.
- ⁹cf. Grässer Parusieverzögerung pp. 131ff., 149 and Tödt op. cit. 182.
- ¹⁰see Geschichte p. 132, History p. 125 cf. Tödt op cit pp.180ff. and Hahn op. cit. p. 377.
- ¹¹It is a parallel saying to viii.31, especially when linked with ix. 9b, but represents a different version of Ps. cxviii. 22.

¹²cf. Grässer, op. cit, pp. 150f.

¹³'Gegenwart und Zukunft' Z.Th.K. 54, 1957 p. 292.

¹⁴cf. also Tödt op. cit. p. 183

¹⁵op. cit. pp. 334ff.

(xi) The challenge and significance of the historical Jesus on the way to the passion, Mk. ix. 14-xii-37

With ix. 14ff. we are back in the context of Jesus' earthly life with what might appear to be a misplaced healing miracle. The interest of the pericope would seem to lie in the disciples' faith and their ability to work miracles. This fits with a part of the gospel where private instruction of the disciples predominates.¹ There is some confusion, however, in VV. 22f., where the reference now is to the faith of the petitioner - (see V. 24) - whereas originally it was probably to that of the miracle-worker and of the disciples in particular, cf. VV. 19, 28f.² VV. 28f. show that the pericope had the same pattern of private instruction of disciples discerned already at iv. 10, 13ff. and vii. 17ff. in the pre-Markan tradition.

The present story is united around the theme of the power of faith³. In earlier miracle stories in Mark faith was a concept related to the question of the historical Jesus and not to that of miracles in themselves. This would seem to be an example which has grown to paradigmatic importance for the question of the relation between the church's teaching and ministry, and the historical Jesus. This is the significance in Mark of V.19. In that verse there is reflexion back on to the period of

Jesus' presence from the time of the church, and an insistence on faith as crucial for the church's ministry. Lohmeyer describes the pericope (p. 191)⁴ as 'an event of the story of Jesus grown to paradigmatic significance for the life of the church', presenting 'the prototype and model of its own faith', a faith which seeks in Jesus, despite the change of time, the regulating force for a changed situation. V.24 reduces the interest in faith as a means of working a miracle, and places the emphasis on Jesus himself as the source, object and answerer of faith. In this context V. 25 assists the secrecy-theme with regard to miracles.

ix. 30ff. portray Jesus passing incognito through Galilee on the way to the cross, as the Son of Man who must first die and rise before he can be made known. This incognito, which is derived from the passion, casts its shadow over Jesus' earthly life and ministry. This is evident from the standpoint of the Gospel looking back over Jesus' life. The mention of Galilee is meant to draw together ~~with~~ the whole of Jesus' ministry, as Mark has described it, and view it from the far side of the passion. The disciples are portrayed typically as not understanding all this (V.32).

ix. 33ff. various sayings and pericopae are held

together by catchwords but also by a general significance. They are about discipleship of Jesus - VV.37, 39, 41. Humility, acceptance of others, reverence for the 'little ones', sacrifice for the sake of the kingdom of heaven are all demanded by following Jesus. This collection is parallel to those after viii.31 and x.33f. and has its significance from the theme of following the crucified Jesus.

x.1ff. is another dispute with Pharisees, which ends with private instruction of the disciples (VV. 10ff.). Instruction of the disciples is also central to VV.13ff., and 17ff. Here attitude and response with regard to the kingdom of God are the themes. Leaving all for the sake of Jesus and the Gospel is what is required (V.29). The theme of following Jesus is set in the light of the cross in VV.32ff. The disciples remain afraid and uncomprehending in face of the third saying about the suffering, death and resurrection of the Son of Man. This contains a full account of the sufferings of Jesus, but not in complete accord with the Marcan passion narrative in that here only the Gentiles' abuse of Jesus is mentioned. These sayings must be independent of the present passion narrative and belong to the utterances of early Christian apocalyptic.

x. 35ff. is the culmination of the section of private teaching of the disciples and connects this theme with the christological interest of this part of the gospel. It is in this way the culmination of the christological reinterpretation of the eschatological 'following' of Jesus in terms of the passion. This is in accord with viii. 34-38. The depicting of the Son of Man as the crucified Jesus, whom the disciples 'follow' on the way to the cross, and whom they are called to 'follow', is the means by which this is done. The passion is shown as the factor which transformed the eschatological message of Jesus into one centred on his person as Saviour and Messiah and as the means by which he came to be identified with the Son of Man. By his identification with the Son of Man, the Son of Man became the dispenser of salvation and the agent of redemption. The key verses in Mark for this process are viii. 38 and x.45, both of which, in their present form and setting presuppose the passion of Jesus and connect it with the Son of Man expectation and require an ultimate identification between Jesus and the Son of Man. This identification is of the kind which stems from the inseparability of the two figures. Jesus' life and death receive their "raison d'être" from the Son of Man expectation, and the historical Jesus

provides the point of reference for the coming Son of Man. The association of the two was the work of early Christian theology, whether Jesus preached a coming Son of Man or not, but it presupposes the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus and only makes sense on the basis of that presupposition. The Son of Man is identified with Jesus, rather than vice-versa, although viii.38 shows awareness that this was not always the case. viii.38, however, in its present form and context, only makes sense if, in the last analysis, the Son of Man turns out to be Jesus himself. But this identification is a secret of Jesus' life and death, which is only revealed to the disciples at the resurrection (ix 9), and will, presumably, only be generally apparent at the parousia (xiv. 62). The passion changed the disciples' eschatological expectation into one centred on Jesus as the Son of Man and caused a re-orientation in their approach. This is the point of x.35-45.

The passage, like others in Mark, combines different material. A separate pericope, VV. 35-40, is concerned with status in the kingdom of God (cf. ix.33ff.). Into this have been inserted VV. 38c, d, 39⁵. V.41 provides a connecting link with VV. 42ff. These last few verses have a parallel in Lk. xxix. 25-27. Lk. xxii. 27 suggests

that V. 45b is an elaboration of the saying with specific reference to the cross, and hence to the soteriological significance of Jesus in connection with the Son of Man⁶. The resulting use of the Son of Man title is distinctively Marcan and serves his purposes as outlined here. The saying has a christological-soteriological meaning⁷. Johannes Weiss may well be right to see this verse as the central point of the message of the evangelist⁸. It asserts the meaning of Jesus' life and death in his sacrifice for others, and his availability for our redemption through his resulting identification with the Son of Man, whereby the future holds salvation and not condemnation for those trusting in him. The verse crystallizes the christological message of the gospel and also the basis of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. It shows too that fundamental to that Gospel is the historical givenness of Jesus to our faith as the Christ, in suffering and humility. This is the soteriological basis of the historical secret of Jesus' messiahship and identification with the coming Son of Man, an identification which gives meaning to that secret as soteriological concealment. ~~The identification which gives meaning to that secret as soteriological concealment.~~ The identification

could not be made historically, since it had to be achieved by a process of sacrifice. This is made clear by looking back on the passion in its redemptive significance. Thus x.45 is the positive aspect, and the explanation, of viii.38. But the setting of Jesus over against the Son of Man and his repudiation of messiahship had to be held to the bitter end for either viii. 38 or x.45 to be possible or valid. Thus the secret had to pervade the whole of Mark's gospel up to the passion, and it had to be reflected in the lack of understanding of the disciples. The historical Jesus had to be differentiated from the post-resurrection proclamation of him in order to be true to history as well as to the presupposition of the Gospel in the historical Jesus himself, which it was the purpose of Mark to present. Mark shows how crucial the historical Jesus is, precisely in the concealment of his identity, as 'the Man for others', by which he revolutionises the concept of the Son of Man. The message of the gospel is summed up in x. 45.

But it is misleading to see this revolution as carried out by Jesus' reinterpretation of the concept of Messiahship by means of the concept of the suffering servant of Isaiah liii, with the use of an ambiguous and puzzling form of self-designation which the disciples, naturally, did not understand - even if this use of the Son of Man title

were linguistically possible. Rather Mark has used the kerygma of the church, which took Jesus' passion and resurrection for granted, to illuminate Jesus' earthly life.¹⁰ In any case the saying as it now stands here clearly serves the interests of the evangelist and belongs to the context of Jesus' identification with the Son of Man after the passion even if some more general 'I' saying emphasizing service is behind it (cf. Lk. xxii. 27b).

The Son of Man material in this part of Mark is set in relation to parenetic material instructing and exhorting the disciples about the demands of the kingdom of God in their following of Jesus¹¹ - see ix.1, ix.41, 43, 45, 47, x.15, 17ff., 26, 27ff., 35ff. - in order to interpret this christologically with regard to the passion of Jesus - cf. viii. 34f., 38, x.21, 28, 32, 43ff. vii. 38 is explained by x.45. The disciples are offered the path to glory through suffering, opened out by Jesus. More than imitation is involved¹², but not penal substitution since the context (which is crucial)¹³ is about following Jesus: 'being conformed to his death' is the point. The setting is in the preaching of the post-resurrection church¹⁴, but the reference is still to the historical Jesus and the incognito of his death, which made that preaching meaningful.

Jesus is the author and finisher of our faith and of him we are not to be ashamed. The paradoxical structure of the Gospel kerygma in its concern with the historical Jesus as the Son of Man is what is evident in x.45.¹⁵

Thus the Son of Man sayings in Mark, of which this is chief, are not descriptions purely and simply of the historical Jesus, nor of the Son of Man concealed on earth. The concealment comes from the combination of the historical incognito of Jesus with the apocalyptic conception of the Son of Man, and from the explanation of history provided by the Gospel. Its use is the direct result of the fact that the person of Jesus provides the bridge between the soteriological preaching of Jesus and the christology of the church, such that he is seen as the guarantor of the salvation he proclaimed¹⁶. The passion was the means by which this is so. The appearance of the Son of Man as such would destroy the incognito, but in the church's christology the conception has come to have soteriological significance, in that when the Son of Man is revealed he will be revealed as Jesus, who was crucified, and hence bring the secret to an end.¹⁷ The church's faith in the resurrection is a foretaste of that. It is from this point of view that the historical mission of Jesus is described in Mk. x. 45.

It is not necessarily accepted here, from Tödt, that

Jesus must have himself proclaimed the coming Son of Man as bringing his own mission to fulfilment, though without identifying him with himself, along the lines of Lk. xii. 8f. (//Mk. viii.38), since the evidence is very slender (only very few sayings in Tödt's estimation¹⁸) and the sayings in Mark all have a secondary function and would seem to be themselves secondary. But the question is not settled. In the gospels the Son of Man is clearly identified with Jesus, in one way or another, though secondarily to the kerygmatic tradition. The chapters on Matthew and Luke will show how those two evangelists have developed the conception of the Son of Man with reference to Jesus, using the Marcan outline and on the basis of apocalyptic material and 'Q', to present an apocalyptic or historical scheme, involving a more direct description of the earthly Jesus as the concealed Son of Man. But Tödt is right that this is not the case in the earlier tradition and 'Q'. He does not, however, deal with the redaction of the sayings in the context of the gospels themselves, but rather in the tradition.

x.46ff. is notable for the open address of Jesus by the blind man as son of David (V.48), which the crowds try to quieten. Burkill sees here an indication that the secret has begun to break through, and the tension in the

Marcan narrative to snap¹⁹. Wrede considered that this passage had nothing to do with the messianic secret²⁰. Neither of these views seems to be right, though Wrede may be right that the crowd's attempt to silence Bartimaeus had nothing to do with the Marcan theme of secrecy.

Burkill sees the messianic secret as part of Mark's 'philosophy of history'. Mark was interested in Jesus' life from a theological point of view, as that by which God's purposes were being worked out. There were four periods in the historical realization of God's plan of salvation²¹. The earthly life of Jesus was the first of these and one of concealment. There is considerable tension in the Marcan narrative and an essential ambiguity, a secret allied with a belief in Jesus' messiahship 'which is continually pressing for expression in his (i.e. the evangelist's) account of the Master's earthly career'²². But it seems that the tension is really between history and the Gospel which is inevitable in a work written in the form of a life of Jesus, and that Mark is not so much interested to write an account of the Master's earthly career as to show how history and the Gospel are related around the person of Jesus. The secret preserves the difference between history and the Gospel, but is not meant to imply concealment in the history itself. The discussion of the Son of Man sayings

should show that there is no conception of a historically 'hidden Son of Man in St. Mark's gospel'²³. There is therefore in Mark no historical secret about Jesus' messiahship which had to be kept back during his lifetime²⁴ such that Jesus' life is the 'locus of secret revelation'²⁵ rather it was kept back by the history itself. Mark is bearing witness to a fact of secrecy and not trying to escape from it. He is not tempted to describe Jesus' life in messianic terms: vii. 27ff. and xii. 35ff. show that he believes that Jesus is the Messiah, but as the Son of Man who had first to die, not as the historical son of David.

x.48 bears witness to ascriptions to Jesus of the title Messiah during his lifetime and its use in Christian tradition, but this is no 'strain on the secret' nor evidence that it is not still in operation in Mark. For Mark it is the very essence of the secret, in the facts of history, that Jesus went to the cross accompanied by greetings as Messiah - here by a blind man - and was in fact crucified as a messianic pretender. This was prepared for and explained in viii.27-ix.13. But Jesus is not and was not the kind of Messiah conceived of in history then - see xii. 35ff., and xiv 61ff. - and his kind of messiahship demanded, or takes account of, the passion. It is perverse

to see the secret historically as necessitated by the fact that Jesus was a different kind of Messiah and as an attempt to avoid misunderstanding. If that had been the case Jesus could have put people right. In any case we ought not to see the secret as an attempt to avoid what actually happened, what, according to Mark had to happen, because of the kind of Messiah Jesus actually was, or is. That it happened like that is for Mark all part of the secret. Jesus had to be and was the crucified Messiah. This approach makes sense of the secret in Mark and of the gospel narrative as a whole, as a presentation of the historical presupposition of the Gospel in the person of Jesus. The secret is intended to make plain what kind of narrative it is, not to be ~~of the narrative~~ a device of the narrative as such or a historical 'theory'. The gospel shows how the Gospel can expound the history itself in terms of Jesus' person in a way not possible for Jesus' contemporaries.

Thus the secret is operative as a fact in x.46ff. It is not true that the passion narrative in Mark is virtually Johannine in that the passion is the glorification of Jesus - as Burkill says - but it is true that the crucifixion of Jesus as Messiah is both a historical proclamation of Jesus' messiahship, and represents its historical hiddenness most

fully. The same goes for his proclamation as son of David on the way to the cross. xii.35ff. shows what kind of Messiah Jesus must be. But he becomes that by crucifying the son of David, or being crucified as the son of David. That is the historical secret of his messiahship, which Mark brings out admirably and which is a necessary precondition for the Gospel of his messiahship. The opening of the blind man's eyes and his subsequent following on the way to the cross symbolizes the opening of the eyes of faith into the true nature of Jesus' messiahship through the cross. The secret is not presented in Mark as a factor within history, but of history itself. This secret is what the Gospel proclaims of Jesus. This is the relationship between history and Gospel which Mark illustrates in his narrative, by means of the theme of secrecy. This is also the explanation of the ambiguity with regard to Jesus in the gospel, and of the tension in the narrative.

It takes a liking for the paradoxical to accept the fact that xi. 1-10 describes the way to the passion. Yet this is precisely what it is. Jesus enters Jerusalem amidst intense eschatological excitement (V.10). At the very least he enters as the eschatological prophet, possibly as the Messiah, the son of David. But it is impossible not to escape the irony inherent in the situation when viewed from

the standpoint of the Gospel. No attempt at secrecy could be expected here because that would suggest that what is openly proclaimed is the truth which should be suppressed.²⁶ That is not the point of the secrecy-theme in Mark. Rather is the secret preserved in the history itself; the Gospel brings it to light. Jesus' messiahship was in fact claimed historically, but within that context it could not be adequate and this was not understood because it depended on the passion and resurrection (see viii.31, ix. 9f.).

In xi. 12ff. two stories are intertwined, the withering of the fig-tree and the cleansing of the temple. Both are symbolic and parabolic actions. They describe the hidden challenge of the person of Jesus present in Jerusalem at that time. The action of Jesus in the temple is set by Mark if not by John ii. 13ff. in close relation with the circumstances of Jesus' death (V.18). It marks the supreme historical confrontation between Jesus and the religious leaders of his time, which is also reflected throughout the gospel in the debates (cf. iii.6) - although these are, of course, also crossed with the christological implications which the Gospel draws out and which can only have appeared in debates between the church and Jewish leaders in the light of the Gospel. Within this confrontation is seen the historical secret of Jesus'

identity and authority - ἐξουσία (vv. 27ff.). The historical Jesus is the point of concern of Gospel and of unbelief, and his historical incognito. In a sense Burkill is right²⁷ that with the passion there is a "historical realization of the essential meaning of his (i.e. Jesus') Messiahship'. The Messiah is historically declared, but remains unknown, because, for Mark, the Gospel was not yet, because Jesus was not yet glorified. Here, in the passion the secret is complete, and requires nothing except the passion-narrative itself to expound it. The passion-narrative, from which the gospel grew backwards²⁸, is the ground for the secret throughout (see Mk. viii.30f.). It is not true that here the Marcan secrecy-scheme breaks up, any more than it is so when Mark refers to the passion using the Son of Man title²⁹ (viii. 31, ix. 9b, 12b, 31, x. 45, 33f., xiv. 21, 41b). Mark's consistent reference to the passion in terms of the Son of Man expresses the secret of the messiahship of the crucified Jesus and his identification with the Son of Man. The disciples' lack of understanding witnesses to the historical aspect of the secret involved there. It is as difficult to identify a historical person with the Son of Man, as to identify a crucified man with the Messiah.³⁰ But the Gospel does both together; and this is the explanation of the secrecy-theme in Mark.

The question about Jesus' authority in xi. 27ff. is related to the questions outlined above. The apparently evasive counter-question about John the Baptist (V. 30) is not so when the significance of John the Baptist in relation to Jesus is considered from other parts of the gospel (cf. vi. 14ff., viii. 27ff., ix. 11ff.). The counter-question really only shows the nature of the first question in historical terms and raises it on to a different level. It is really up to those who ask it to answer it. The historical Jesus will not do so himself. The question about John the Baptist is the same kind of question, and serves to reveal the unwillingness of the first questioners to answer ~~for~~ themselves.

Mark obviously regards the parable in xii. 1ff. as an answer to the question of xi. 28, which condemns Jesus' contemporaries (see VV. 10-12). Ps. cxviii. 22f. is a basic text (cf. I Peter ii.7, Acts iv 11, and Mk. viii. 31 and ix. 12)³¹. The historical Jesus was rejected, but nevertheless exalted. But this is not what the parable originally taught. It is the redactional work of the evangelist which connects it with the passion of Jesus (V.12). But the high-priests and scribes, to whom the parable is addressed (see xi. 27, xii. 1a, 12), do not know what they are doing whereas the husbandmen of V.7 recognize the son!

The secret is preserved in Jesus' rejection (V.10). The original point of the parable must have been the wickedness of the husbandmen, although in the context of the Gospel it has a further meaning concerned with the incognito of the historical Jesus. Historically it could as well have been spoken with reference to John the Baptist (cf. Mtt. xxi.32). The person of the son in the parable is not stressed as a direct description by Jesus of his status - if the son in the parable is pre-existent so are the slaves in the same sense, without the difference that they can be thought of as pre-existent only in the divine plan and foreknowledge. The parable teaches that the religious leaders have usurped what belongs to God. The impossibility of the story as far as the behaviour and expectation of the husbandmen are concerned³² only shows the absurdity of their position. This is what Jesus, and John the Baptist, challenged. But the seriousness of the challenge and the response to it is only expressed by the christological text in VV.10f. The real challenge was in the person of Jesus whose exaltation after rejection was the act of God against that of men, God's word in the Gospel over against the actions of men in history.

How far the parable was connected by Jesus with his own conscious mission is difficult to judge. But the nature of his eschatological message must have had some consciousness

of the last appeal of God in history as its basis. Jesus may have made some conscious last appeal to Jerusalem in a way reflected in Lk. xiii. 31ff., 34ff., xix. 41ff. cf. Mtt. xxiii. 34ff., 37ff. - cf. too Lk. xi. 49ff., which suggest a quotation from extra - canonical sapiential literature. If this is so then the Gospel is shown to be historically based in the historicity of Jesus, though its significance, christologically and soteriologically, is proclaimed only by the Gospel itself. The secret is a proper reflection of this relationship between Gospel and history with regard to the person of Jesus.

The difference between the treatment of this relationship in Mark from that in Matthew and Luke is a useful support for this view of the function of the secrecy-theme. Luke stresses the quality of time in the historical challenge of Jesus to Jerusalem before the passion (see xix. 41ff. and xx.18). There were historical results from the rejection of that challenge. Matthew also saw a historical turningpoint in the rejection of Jesus (Mtt. xxi.43). This was, as we shall see, because of a different view of the relation between the Gospel and history as expressed in a different interpretation of the theme of concealment. For Mark the passion was the historical counterpart for the 'theologoumenon' of the messianic secret. Historically Jesus had to

be rejected (see viii. 31, δεῖ), as supported by scripture. The historical Messiah was for Mark the rejected Messiah. Mark does not schematize this, but expresses quite baldly the continuing relation between history and Gospel in both its positive and negative aspects, and asserts it as a necessary relation - hence his doctrine of the secret. It conforms with his view of what kind of Messiah Jesus was and had to become (viii. 27ff., xii. 35ff.). He does not present the parable in xii 1 ff. as an allegorical account of God's dealings in the historical situation, since, as such, it would make nonsense of God's dealings with men.

The collection of debates, which Mark has set in the context of the passion (V.13, though cf. iii.6), may have their origin as a group along the rabbinic pattern of four different types of questions belonging to the passover Haggadah³³. Thus V. 34b may not be a redactional element but part of the pattern, where the questions give way to a question in return to the questioners³⁴. The first debate (xii. 14ff.) may have been a messianic temptation, but it shows Jesus' attitude that religious and political affairs are autonomous³⁵. A political messiah is as much out of the question as a historical messiah as far as Jesus is concerned. VV. 18ff. affirm the resurrection and VV. 28ff. emphasize the religious and ethical teaching of Jesus in an eschatological direction (V.34). The climax of the

group are vv. 35ff. which oppose one conception of messiahship to another reflecting that Jesus was not the Messiah as Son of David. ³⁶Ps. cx. 1 is used to portray the essence of Jesus' messiahship as lying in his exaltation by God. This is not a historically visible messiahship, but it takes into account the prior persecution of the Messiah.

References for Chapter Two

 Section (xi)

- ¹ Bornkamm-Barth-Held, Tradition und Auslegung im Matthäusevangelium 1960; Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew London 1963, p. 188 - Held.
- ² see Held op. cit. pp. 190f.
- ³ cf. Held op. cit. p. 187.
- ⁴ op. cit. p. 191.
- ⁵ cf. Lohmeyer op. cit. p. 221.
- ⁶ cf. for V. 45b, Klostermann Das Markusevangelium Tübingen 1926 p. 109, Tödt op. cit. pp. 127f., 187ff., 191-194.
- ⁷ cf. Tödt pp. 191ff.
- ⁸ see reference to Christus die Anfänge des Dogmas 1909 p.79 in Ebeling Das Messiasgeheimnis 1939, p.221 n.2.
- ⁹
- ¹⁰ For criticism of the view that Is. 1111 is used here see Hooker Jesus and the Servant London 1959 pp. 74ff., Barrett 'The Background of Mk. x.45' pp. 1-18 of New Testament Essays (in mem. T.W.Manson) and Hahn op. cit. pp. 52, 57-66. Tödt (op. cit. pp. 189ff.) thinks that the reference to Is. 1111 in V.45b is an interpretative addition to the original saying, referring to the passion.

¹¹cf. Ebeling op. cit. pp. 146-9, 166f.

¹²cf. Ebeling op. cit. pp. 166f.

¹³see Hooker op. cit. p. 75.

¹⁴see Ebeling op. cit. pp. 158ff. *with reference to Jn. xix 58.*

¹⁵cf. Tödt op. cit. p. 128.

¹⁶cf. Tödt op. cit. pp. 207ff., 265.

¹⁷cf. Tödt op. cit. pp. 128-130.

¹⁸op. cit. pp. 206f.

¹⁹'Strain on the Secret' Z.N.W. 51, 1960 pp. 31-46 and Mysterious Revelation New York 1963 pp. 188ff.

²⁰Das Messiasgeheimnis pp. 278f.

²¹Burkill op. cit. pp. 175f.

²²Burkill op. cit. p. 147 n. 1.

²³Z.N.W. 1961 pp. 189-213.

²⁴Mysterious Revelation p. 174.

²⁵Mysterious Revelation p. 180.

²⁶Thus we do not except Manson's criticism (Jesus the Messiah p.10) that the Marcan secrecy-theme is a lack of understanding of what was, rather than what was not proclaimed by Jesus during his lifetime. The full story is that Messiahship was asserted by the disciples ^{and} rejected by Jesus on grounds of a relationship between himself and the Son of Man as the basis of his messiahship, a relationship dependent on the passion. This latter was what was not understood. The Son of Man sayings provide the content of what was not understood and the reason why Peter's 'confession' was silenced, illustrated by his reaction to the passion.

²⁷Mysterious Revelation p. 219.

²⁸Marxsen Markus p. 17.

²⁹Use of such a title in the third person can only be explained on the basis of the later identification of the crucified and risen Jesus with the Son of Man, not as a historical mode of speech.

³⁰cf. Casey I.T.S. NS 9 1958 p. 265 (ref. p.42 Hahn, op. cit.).

³¹see T8dt op. cit. pp. 150ff.

³²as pointed out by Schniewind, op. cit. p. 120, and Lohmeyer, op. cit. pp. 247f.

³³Daube The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism pp. 158ff.

³⁴Daube *ibid* p. 167.

³⁵see Gloege op. cit. pp. 205f.

35 = Note 1 on p. 205.

- (xii) The secret of Jesus' messiahship and the parousia; history and apocalyptic - Mk. xiii.

In chapter xiii the tradition about Jesus' prophecy of the destruction of the temple leads to a long discourse about the time after Jesus' exaltation, the time of the preaching of the Gospel (xiii.10),¹ which is orientated towards the parousia of the Son of Man. This is the time when the secret of Jesus' messiahship weighs on the church.

An old logion, V.2, provides the basis for a collection of material which stresses the lack of direct connection between the fulfilment of the Christian hope and specific historical events, in answer to the question of V. 4. The passage transcends any specific setting and is really addressed to the situation of the church generally², a situation based on the passion and resurrection of Jesus - cf. the Johannine farewell discourses.

Willi Marxsen sees this passage as crucial for the purpose of the gospel as a whole³. According to Marxsen, V.14 shows that the gospel was written before the fall of Jerusalem and in what follows Mark wished to re-emphasize the church's expectation of the parousia of the Son of Man as following almost at once. The immediate message of the gospel is therefore that of xvi 7, a call to abandon Jerusalem to meet the Son of Man in Galilee at his parousia.

Hans Conzelmann⁴³ points out, however, that there is no mention of Galilee in Mk. xiii to connect it with the parousia, nor any stress on a time-sequence or the giving of certain information about the time of the end⁵. The concern is with eschatological expectation. Apocalyptic is made use of, but not to argue from specific historical events to the likelihood of the occurrence of events of another order as a consequence of those historical events. Uncertainty about the end, rather than a stress on its imminence, is the dominant feature, though uncertainty does not necessarily rule out imminence⁶. This is the result of awareness of the delay in the parousia⁷. On this ground one is warned, according to Conzelmann, against certain expectation of the end after the destruction of the temple. The context and concern of the discourse is the expectation of the end after the imminent destruction of the temple, and its aim to discourage that expectation⁸. V. 4 separates the question about the time of the destruction of the temple (V.2) from that about the time of the fulfilment of all things. xiii.32 is meant to discourage conjecture and to stress ignorance of the time of the end and the fact that Jesus never gave, or could give, guidance on the matter. The whole chapter as it now stands in Mark probably has as its origin and 'raison d'être' the previous destruction of the temple⁹.

Dan. xii.11, ix.27 are of immediate relevance, rather than Dan. vii. 13. The present is the time referred to in Mk. ii 19b, 20¹⁰, when the Gospel is to be preached to all nations (xiii.10) - a Marcan addition^{11 12}. The Holy Spirit will guide the preacher and martyr (V.11). The coming of the Son of Man lies in the unknown future.

In this chapter Mark is concerned with the time of the Gospel. It shows too that the whole work belongs to this time and has this standpoint. It is the Gospel which lies in between Jesus' life and eschatological preaching and the coming of the Son of Man. It proclaims the relation between the historical Jesus and the Son of Man. The understanding of history involved here is christologically orientated in that past and future are understood in terms of Jesus' person, whose significance is proclaimed in the present by the church's Gospel. There is no historical presentation of that Gospel, either in terms of Jesus' life nor of the period subsequent to that life; there is only faith in Jesus linked with the expectation of the Son of Man. Neither of these are interpreted historically. The same is true of eschatology. That has undergone a transformation in christological terms. Jesus' preached the kingdom of God; the church, which followed, proclaimed the significance of that preaching in terms of Jesus' person, who proclaimed

it and will come as Son of Man to fulfil it. There is a secret, which covers both his historical activity and his coming as Son of Man: it is the secret of his person. Only the parousia, which cannot be dated from history, will dispel that secret (xiii.26). The sight of the Son of Man will answer the questions about Jesus' identity, which arise from his earthly life (xiv.61f.). This is the essence of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, which has its roots in Jesus' earthly life, as it is described by Mark.

xiii.26 - which is a quotation from Daniel in the spirit of I Enoch - must be taken as a reference to Jesus himself. But that is only clear when the life of Jesus is seen in the light of the post-resurrection Gospel. In that context it can refer only to Jesus, though this is not an obvious fact of history. The pre-existence of the Son of Man is perceived in the life of Jesus^{12/1}. The continuity in the chapter is not found in historical events leading to their consummation, but in the identity between Jesus and the Son of Man^{13/2}. We are warned against deceivers, false christs and false prophets (VV.6, 21f.). The message that Jesus left with his church is to watch (V.37). This is christological watching for Jesus himself, a continuation by the disciples of Jesus' watch in Gethsemane, as a result of the passion and resurrection.

The Son of Man sayings are shown as the clue to the presentation of Jesus in the gospel. They do not interpret Jesus' historical significance, but the historical Jesus is seen as providing the personal content of the Son of Man expectation. Also, the Son of Man expectation explains the nature of Jesus' messiahship. The church knows the identity of the Son of Man and of the Messiah and will not be deceived by impersonations (V.6)^{14/13}. Jesus is the Lord who told his servants to watch for his return (V.34). He is not historically identifiable as the Messiah or as the Son of Man, but he provides the identity of both. The Son of Man is still a figure of apocalyptic, not of history, but the historical Jesus alone allows us to make sense of the Son of Man expectation, though this is possible only after the resurrection. The latter aspect explains the disciples' lack of understanding as part of the theme of secrecy; a part which, on Burkill's understanding, is contradictory of the other part^{15/14}, because he interpreted the secrecy-theme as a device concerned with Jesus' Life rather than as concerned with the relation between the historical Jesus and the Gospel.

References for Chapter Two

Section (xii)

- 1¹ = 36 a p. 280
cf. Wrede 'Jesus als Davidssohn' Vorträge und Studien pp. 147ff; this is a rejection of one kind of messiahship for another reflecting Jesus not being the expected kind and the post-resurrection faith in Jesus' messiahship - as against the liberal explanation of it as Jesus' definition of his messiahship against political understanding, or the orthodox of Jesus' being more than David's Son.
- 2² cf. Lohmeyer op. cit. p. 267.
- 3³ Der Evangelist Markus pp. 101ff.)
- 4⁴ 'Geschichte und Eschaton nach Mk. 13' N.N.W. 1959 pp. 210ff.
- 5⁵ ibid p. 215.
- 6⁶ see Conzelmann op. cit. pp. 221f., cf. also Grässer Das Problem der Parusieverzögerung. Beihefte zur N.N.W. 22, Berlin 1957, pp. 152-170, esp. p. 169.
- 7⁷ Conzelmann ibid pp. 213f, and Marxsen op.cit p.119, Grässer op. cit. passim.
- 8⁸ Conzelmann ibid p. 215 n. 27.
- 9⁹ It may be, however, that an earlier form of the discourse had prophesied the end after the temple's destruction. But Mark has corrected this, particularly in VV. 32ff.

7 ¹⁰Conzelmann ibid p. 211.

6 ¹¹Conzelmann p. 219 Marxsen Markus p. 81.

0 ¹²Conzelmann ibid p. 217, n. 36.

12 ¹³Conzelmann ibid pp. 216f.

12 ¹⁴cf. Conzelmann ibid p. 218.

14 ¹⁵Burkill op. cit. p. 187.

(xiii) The secret of Jesus' messiahship and the passion; the passion-narrative, Mk. xiv, xv.

xiv. 1, 2 continue the story of xii.12, with the developing plots of Jesus' enemies. The passion narrative proper is introduced by xiv. 3ff¹. Its present form presupposes failure to anoint the body of Jesus after death. This shows that this is secondary in that it depends on its connection with a passion narrative where the anointing of Jesus' dead body did not take place. V.8 represents this development of the tradition. V.V. 4-7 also connect the woman's action with the approaching passion. V. 3b represents the basic tradition. When it became connected with the passion-narrative is uncertain², but that the passage has been extended in the context of the passion is obvious³. The action may have originally had a messianic significance. In Lk. vii. 36ff. it is penitential, but there is no hint of that here. V.9 probably represents Mark's interest (cf. xiii.10). The meaning of the woman's action will be expounded by the Gospel. Here is virtually direct comment by the evangelist on the use of historical traditions in the kerygma. The significance of V.9 is shown by its solemn introduction. It stands over against the contemporary lack of understanding of Jesus' disciples (VV.4,5). The 'betrayal' of Judas

(VV. 10f.) does not contradict this; it is not the messianic secret that Judas betrays, nor any messianic claim on Jesus' part. But his 'betrayal' of the historical Jesus stands over against the messiahship of Jesus as understood by the Gospel and helps to fulfil it. Ironically enough it may well have been messianic claims on the part of some of Jesus' followers which ~~were~~ the pretence for Jesus' arrest and execution.

The eating of the passover in VV. 12ff. may have been intended by Jesus as the 'last' supper in an eschatological sense (see V.25), i.e. the last before the coming of the kingdom. But what is described in VV.22ff. is a continuing rite between Jesus death and parousia. It records Jesus' last meal with his disciples before the passion. It belongs to the context of the fate of the Son of Man according to scripture and history (V.21). The verb ὑπάγει anticipates Johannine usage (cf. Jn. vii. 33, xvi. 5, xvi.10, 17; xiii.3; viii.14a; viii.21f.; xiii. 33, 36; xiv. 28; xiv.4f.; I Jn. ii.11: we might compare the same in xiv. 35, - ἡ ὥρα cf. Jn. vii.30, viii.20, xiii-1; and ii.4, xii.23, xii.27a; xvii.1,⁴.

In this passage we have a saying about the Son of Man, the Eucharistic words of commemoration, and eschatological prophecy. These are followed in VV. 26ff. by a reference

to the flight of the disciples, into which there is inserted mention of the resurrection (V.28, cf. xvi.7). This would seem to be a redactional insertion in both places, aimed perhaps at uniting two resurrection traditions⁵. It is probably concerned with a resurrection appearance and the subsequent preaching of the Gospel⁶. It may be right that Galilee is viewed as the place of revelation⁷. But it is true that this is manifestly not the case at ix.30. Probably there is a contrast between Jesus' lifetime and the time of the preaching of the Gospel after the resurrection. It is hard to see a reference to the parousia, which is how Marxsen interprets the saying⁸. The reference is rather to Jesus' manifestation to the disciples after the resurrection.

Jesus' eschatological passion watch in Gethsemane, in vv.32ff., has three reminiscences of the Lord's prayer - VV. 36(2), 38, with *γρηγορεῖτε* in VV. 34, 38 reminiscent of xiii 37. These are eschatological traits, which, in VV. 41f., have been combined with the context of the passion⁹. The authority of the Son of Man in VV. 21, 41¹⁰ contrasts with the Gethsemane prayer of Jesus. It also contrasts with history itself. But it explains the fact that Burkill can speak of a Johannine equation of Jesus' crucifixion with his glorification as Son of Man¹¹.

But this is the historical presupposition for the statements of viii. 31, ix.31, x.33f., and x.45.

The christological 'trial' of Jesus before the chief priests sums up the relation between the historical Jesus and the Son of Man, and the issue of the historical secret of Jesus' messiahship over against the Gospel proclamation of him. xiv.62 is made up of two quotations, Ps. cx.1 and Dan. vii.13¹², which refer to the exaltation and the parousia of the Son of Man. The question whether Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of the Blessed, is answered in the affirmative with the statement that the chief priests will see the advent of the Son of Man. The relevance of this statement depends on Jesus' crucifixion and resurrection, and his identification with the exalted and coming Son of Man. Then it will be the Son of Man's turn to reject those who rejected Jesus (viii.38). The historical Jesus was the crucified Messiah. Here the historical secret, which will persist till the parousia of the Son of Man, is most evident. It is there in the historical offence at Jesus, the shame of his cross, and the ascription of messiahship to a crucified man. This is described here (v. 64a) as blasphemy. The historical offence and shame of Jesus is complete in the denial of Jesus by Peter (VV. 66ff.). It had, after all, been Peter who had insisted that Jesus

was the Messiah (viii.29), but who refused to accept the necessity of the passion (viii.32f).

In chapter xv Jesus is arraigned before Pilate on a false charge¹³. It is false, because, even if it is assumed with some texts of Mark that Jesus admitted that he was the Christ at the Jewish trial, he did not say he was the kind of Messiah mentioned here. This is differentiated from Jesus' kind of messiahship by the phrase, the king of the Jews (xv.2, 9, 12, 18, 26, 32). The origin of the phrase here is probably a reliable tradition about the 'titulus' on the cross. Schniewind is right¹⁴ that here there is still the messianic secret, in the history itself. Indeed the very accusation, though false, is a hidden pointer to Jesus' identity. The open proclamation of the 'titulus', which asserts what it was forbidden to the disciples to proclaim, preserves the secret absolutely. Jesus was the crucified Messiah, and is the Son of Man. Historically his messiahship is denied whilst it is affirmed, and affirmed whilst it is denied. The secret could never have got out. It is undisclosed to Jesus himself (xv.34). The mistaking of his cry as being for Elijah is a crowning irony (cf. ix. 13). The Gospel proclaims this historical Jesus as the Messiah, but does not proclaim a historical Christ.¹⁵ Even if Jesus

had claimed to be the Messiah this would have been the same.¹⁶
 That Jesus is the Messiah can only be asserted adequately
 by the Gospel. In history it remains a secret. This must
 be accepted even when it is asserted that Jesus was the
 Messiah, because that fact is only made known by the Gospel.
 The secrecy-theme in Mark preserves this. It does not
 seek to reconcile history and the Gospel, nor is it part
 of history itself. But it insists that despite all
 appearances to the contrary it is right to call Jesus
 the Messiah; it is right (ἀληθῶς) to say: this
 man was (ἦν) the Son of God (xv.39b.).

References for Chapter Two.

Section (xiii)

- ¹ cf. Daube op. cit. pp. 312ff., esp. pp. 322ff.).
- ² see Marxsen Markus p. 81).
- ³ cf. Grässer Parusieverzögerung pp. 40ff.
- ⁴ see Tödt op. cit. p. 174, though some texts are wrongly quoted.
- ⁵ cf., for the view that it is an interpolation and redactional, Marxsen Der Evangelist Markus p.47, Lohmeyer op. cit. p. 312, R. H. Lightfoot The Gospel Message of St. Mark Oxford 1950, pp. 93ff., 106ff., Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels London 1938 pp.52ff and Grässer Parusieverzögerung p.30 n.7.
- ⁶ cf. C. F. Evans 'I will go before you into Galilee' J.T.S. V 1954 pp. 3ff.
- ⁷ cf. Lohmeyer commentary op.cit. p. 312, and Galiläa und Jerusalem Göttingen 1936 pp. 10ff., contrast Burkill op.cit. pp. 252ff.
- ⁸ see Markus pp. 101ff.
- ⁹ cf. Tödt op. cit. p. 173.
- ¹⁰ cf. Tödt op. cit. pp. 183ff.

¹¹Burkill op. cit. p. 70.

¹²Tödt op. cit. pp. 33-37.

¹³cf. Burkill Mysterious Revelation pp. 295ff.

¹⁴op. cit. pp. 167f.

¹⁵cf. Bultmann Das Verhältnis der urchristlichen Christusbotschaft zum historischen Jesus pp. 8ff.

¹⁶Bultmann ibid pp. 8f.

(xiv) The resurrection, Mk. xvi 1-8

The last few verses of Mark seem completely disconnected. It is not just that from a literary point of view they appear truncated, but their content seems unrelated to anything else. For Mark V.7 is crucial, but is cancelled out by V.8. Not only does nothing follow V.8, but it is difficult to see what could follow V. 8. V. 7 suggests appearances in Galilee, but, on the basis of V.8 there is no suggestion how the disciples got to Galilee, unless in a manner quite unconnected with the empty tomb tradition. V.7 is a later insertion which is consistent with a quite independent, and probably older, tradition of Galilaean appearances. It may well be true that the Marcan narrative was disrupted from within because of a conflict between rival and irreconcilable traditions¹. There is no connection between Jn. xx and xxi because they represent quite separate traditions. Matthew and Luke support different traditions, but both have to alter Mark in various ways, in respect of either V.7 or V.8. There is no hint of how Mark could have continued, as Matthew and Luke both discovered. It is probable that V.7 is an insertion into a tradition of Jerusalem appearances with which is connected the tradition of the empty tomb (which is unknown to Paul in I Cor. xv). The intention was to

introduce the Galilaean tradition of appearances of Jesus. The two traditions are incompatible as well as independent, and it is just possible that V. 8 would have preserved their incompatibility and independence. But the effect is certainly clumsy, and may have lead to a deletion of what followed. As V. 7 shows, Mark's preference must have been for the Galilaean tradition. The resurrection appearance to the disciples in Galilee must have been independent of the testimony of the women at the tomb because of V.8.

V. 7 seems to be an attempt to link Galilaean appearances with the Jerusalem tradition of the empty tomb in another way as well. The 'young man' tells the women to remind the disciples of Jesus' words to them at xiv. 28 in the context of the pre-passion prophecy of the disciples' flight. This may cover the fact that they fled to Galilee at Jesus' arrest anyway, and only later returned to Jerusalem. But it is interesting that there was a νεανίσκος in the Gethsemane garden too, who had been clothed (περιβεβλημένος) with a linen cloth, and fled naked (xiv. 51f.). He must have heard the words of xiv.28, according to Mark's account. The question is whether it is this young man, and no angel, who is referred to at xvi.5, clothed (περιβεβλημένος)

with a white robe, and who was a means by which the traditions were reconciled.

But the lack of historical connection in the Marcan account and its lack of continuity only ~~to~~ serve to emphasize the lack of continuity involved in what is described. It is no good seeking Jesus of Nazareth the one who was crucified - 'Ιησοῦν τὸν Ναζαρηνὸν τὸν ἑσταυρωμένον - because he is risen. That is the message of the empty tomb. The kerygma of the resurrection takes the place of the historical Jesus, and that alone provides continuity. Back in Galilee the disciples receive their second commission, no longer to be with Jesus, but to preach. The real return of Jesus would be the parousia of the Son of Man. The present task of the disciples is plain from Mk. ix-9, to reveal the secret about Jesus which had been made known to them.

References for Chapter Two.

Section (xiv)

- ¹Bacon The Gospel of Mark 1925 pp. 187ff., esp. p. 203.

(xv) Conclusions.

Since there is no conclusion to Mark's gospel, it is doubly difficult to come to a conclusion about it. But there can be no doubt but that the real conclusion to the gospel is the Gospel about, as well as of, Jesus Christ, and that this is what remains between the life of Jesus and the parousia. This Gospel depends on what Mark has described in his work, which has as its form and content the life of Jesus. But the Gospel itself is not in this form, nor has it this content. The Gospel is of and about Jesus Christ. The life of Jesus - and that means his historicity - is the presupposition of that Gospel.

The theme of secrecy marks the division between Gospel and history. It is necessitated by the form and content of Mark's work, to avoid the conclusion that this is to be equated with the Gospel. But it also insists that the content of the Gospel is there too, and that is the person of Jesus himself. Mark's gospel provides us with his historical identity, which has been said to be a presupposition of the Gospel, and also shows how the Gospel depends on his historical identity. It also shows us that what the Gospel says of him is not the same as his historical identity, though inseparable from it.

Mark clearly believed that he was writing about the earthly life of the one who is the Messiah, the Son of Man,

the Son of God. But he does not equate his earthly life with his being these things. Rather is his being these things the secret of that earthly life. The nature of that life contradicts his being the Messiah, and the earthly life itself contradicts his being the Son of Man. Yet both these conceptions are to be interpreted from his earthly life. The basis for this was his being the Son of God (i.11, 24, iii.11, v.7, ix.7, xii. 6, xiii. 32 (xiv. 62,) xv. 39). But he was the hidden Son of God.

The various prohibitions to speak of miracles, of his messiahship, and of the transfiguration, emphasize the secret of his life, which is the Gospel. The disciples' lack of understanding with regard to that secret emphasizes that the Gospel was not contemporary with Jesus, but came later, at the resurrection (ix. 9). The latter verse shows that i.1 cannot imply the beginning of the Gospel at a point within Jesus' life, or before it, except in the sense that it comprises the origin of the Gospel. The transfiguration answers to the baptism at the beginning of the gospel in that ix.9 asserts that the Gospel itself must begin with the resurrection. Throughout Mark's gospel the disciples are ignorant of the basic presuppositions of the Gospel, and all that they could then say of Jesus - including the statement that he was the Messiah (viii.29) - had to

be denied or only affirmed in the context of the passion, until those presuppositions had been fulfilled in the passion and resurrection of the Son of Man. (vii.31).

The impression of Mark's gospel is not of a scheme in history reaching its fulfilment, but of two aspects of the person of Jesus, one of which could not be discerned till later, because it was not fully true till later. Jesus' messiahship depended on the passion and resurrection, because he was not like other messiahs and any historical description of him would have been misleading. As Messiah he was the expected Son of Man who had first to suffer, die and rise from the dead. But, of course, it would be nonsense to call a historical person the Son of Man. Mark shows no concern, from the standpoint of the Gospel, at allowing viii.38 to follow viii. 31. But the common identity of the Son of Man in each statement depends on the passion and resurrection of Jesus. This was how Jesus fulfilled his messiahship. The point of viii.31 is that this was the means by which Jesus is Messiah, as well as Son of Man. But this was not understood by the disciples during Jesus' earthly life. Mark must have believed that the term Son of Man in viii. 31 was not understood by the disciples. viii. 31 represents the essence of the secret of Jesus' life. It is a drawing together of the argument

of Mark's gospel as a whole. The fact that the saying can scarcely be authentic does not affect this. That Jesus' self-consciousness is hidden from us is but an establishment of Mark's doctrine of the Gospel as the unveiling of the secret of Jesus' life. viii 38 shows that the earthly Jesus and the Son of Man can originally only have been distinguished. Their identity depends on the passion and resurrection of Jesus. Their meaningful relation, in that Jesus has soteriological significance over against the Son of Man - cf. Lk. xii. 8f. - can also only be explained from their identity, on the basis of the passion (Mk.x.45).

This leaves many loose ends and apparent or real inconsistencies. These are the result of the nature of the gospel as a creation out of items in the church kerygma. They cannot be reconciled by a historical reconstruction for which there are no grounds in the text. The material must be taken as it is and in accordance with the evangelist's use of it. Seen in this light it serves the purpose of demonstrating the relation between history and the Gospel in terms of the person of Jesus. The secrecy-theme, which may have a basis in Jesus' discouragement of messianic claims on his behalf and his distrust of the usual messianic expectation, appears to be a device of the evangelist to show the relation between the form of the gospel and its

content, and hence between the life of Jesus and the Gospel about Jesus, of which his life remains the presupposition (Mk.i.1).

Chapter Three, The concealed messiahship in Matthew.

(A) The state of the discussion.

Wrede's work had the great merit of recognizing the theological, as well as literary and historical, implications of the priority of Mark. The secondary nature of the other two synoptic gospels was demonstrated forcibly by the virtual disappearance of the theme of secrecy, especially in Matthew¹. There the stress was rather on the wonder of the revelation in Christ. But to discover the full implications of the absence or alteration of the theme of secrecy in Matthew requires a fuller investigation of the structure of that gospel as a whole. Wrede was content to show the negative historical implications of the theme in Mark, that it was a dogmatic invention of the evangelist, and that Matthew was not aware of the former and emphasized the dogma of Jesus' messiahship. Where the secrecy-theme remained it was reinterpreted as a factor within history. In fact its presence or absence reflects the particular view of the evangelist about the purpose and nature of his gospel and its form and content. It depends on his understanding of history and his interpretation of the Gospel. These are the things which influence his presentation of the kerygmatic tradition. In this respect

both Mark and Matthew performed the same task, with different results, although Matthew also made use of and corrected Mark. Otherwise both evangelists were in the same position with regard to previous tradition, though they treated it differently. Both were also in the same position with regard to history, though they understood it differently. Both had a messianic tradition before them and understood the difficulties of history. But each had a different interpretation of the relation between the two. Over against Wrede the preceding discussion of Mark has attempted to clarify the relation between the previous tradition and the redactional work of the evangelist with regard to the theme of secrecy, and to understand it as an interpretative device. The same needs to be attempted for Matthew, taking into account his use of Mark. The difference in Matthew's treatment of his subject-matter will be revealed by his treatment of the Marcan secrecy-theme.

The work of Sjöberg² differs from this in the following respects. Sjöberg recognized the redactional work of the evangelists, and took into account their divergence from each other and their use of previous tradition. But, for him, the theme of secrecy has its origins back through the

the earlier tradition in the history itself. The work of the evangelists is judged by its use or non-use of this theme. Whilst Mark sharpened it into a dogma (e.g. at iv. 11f.), Matthew and Luke ignored, altered or deleted the elements in Mark such as commands to silence and the disciples' lack of understanding according to their own interpretation of the material before them.

Sjöberg's work stands or falls by his contention that the theme of concealment is to be found in the earliest authentic tradition, and thus that it is an element in history itself. This is allied with the opinion that the authentic Son of Man material, which Sjöberg saw in certain sayings about a future Son of Man, also fitted a pattern of earthly concealment followed by exaltation and future revelation of the Son of Man from heaven. He contends therefore that a body of material can be gathered together which represents the original view of Jesus himself about his messiahship in terms of a temporarily concealed Son of Man. For this view it is necessary to prove that there is in the material in the gospels evidence of the conception of an earthly and concealed counterpart to the expected Son of Man who is Jesus himself, and not just several stages in the Son of Man tradition by which that expected figure is identified with Jesus with no single conception in the

earlier tradition of a concealed Son of Man on earth. It is also necessary to prove that the secrecy-theme is evident in the earliest tradition and not just in Mark's gospel, where it performs a particular function, and where it is added to existing material. It is also necessary to prove that this is a single conception where the idea of a concealed Son of Man is the explanation of the secrecy-theme in terms of Jesus' self-consciousness. The fact that it is not a recognizable element in Jewish Son of Man expectation nor in the gospel material is a serious deficiency. Likewise the fact that the secrecy-theme in Mark is clearly a redactional device of the evangelist rejected by Matthew and Luke is a serious objection. For Sjöberg's view that there is an actual concealment of Jesus' messiahship in his lifetime to carry weight it would be necessary to prove that the element of secrecy was a part of history itself and not just an aspect of that history, or a fact of history over against the Gospel, of which the Marcan theme is intended to take account.

Behind the gospels there is a developing tradition which contains both history and kerygma. Each evangelist has drawn on this tradition, and, in the form of a life of Jesus, has related history to the kerygma, and shown Jesus as the content of both. The veracity of the gospels

does not depend on how things actually happened but on the way they combine history and kerygma. The secrecy-theme in Mark is justified by the way it reveals the relation between history and kerygma. Its omission or alteration in Matthew will be shown to be justified by the evangelist's wish to show the implications for history of the kerygma, and the place of the church (i.e. the disciples) in revealing this. In each case it is possible to see how previous tradition has been used for this purpose. The result of reflection back on history through the kerygma is the way secrecy in Mark and concealment in Matthew qualifies the life of Jesus in each gospel. It is therefore wrong methodologically and theologically to try to sift from the material in the gospels a purely historical picture behind them.

Even if such were discovered it would only justify what the evangelists have done, and show how necessary it was. It would reveal a 'tatsächlich Verborgenheit' (actual concealment) - to use Sjöberg's phrase - of what the Gospel and the church proclaim. The theme of secrecy is implicit in the history from the context of the kerygma, and therefore was implicit in the tradition itself. The themes of secrecy and concealment reveal the witness of history to the

Gospel in that, it is claimed, that the Messiah and the Son of Man are none other than this man, Jesus of Nazareth, whatever appearances are. This is in fact the basis of the Gospel. This is what Mark and Matthew assert in different ways, as well as being the presupposition of their work. Whatever history in itself may be like does not affect this, and can only confirm it. The evangelists no longer knew what Jesus thought. They were dependent on the state of the tradition they received. They probably thought that Jesus did know the content of the Gospel, and he alone, though Matthew obviously saw it as progressively revealed to the disciples too. But it is questionable whether Sjöberg's approach is either possible or justifiable, because of the secrecy-theme itself.

For Sjöberg's thesis to be correct it would be necessary to discover a separate theme of secrecy in the authentic tradition itself, showing an intentional secrecy on Jesus' part in line with his understanding of himself as the Son of Man, and an understanding of the Son of Man involving earthly concealment. The fact that this has not been preserved as such in any of the gospels is a real difficulty, especially when each evangelist has tried to create a pattern more or less along these very lines out of the material to hand, without hiding the fact that this is

a secondary use of it, or being worried by it, but rather in two cases purposely altering the work of Mark in line with their own interpretation.

The structure of the theme of secrecy or concealment in each gospel shows its secondary character, in that it is concerned with the problem of the historical Jesus with regard to the statements of the Gospel. It could not be historical in Mark in the sense that Jesus intended it, since the disciples' lack of understanding cancels out the commands to silence. The presupposition of the theme in Mark is the fact of secrecy, which has been developed into a necessary secret (vii 31, ix 12b, xiv 21). The actual fate of Jesus is now the historical presupposition of the Gospel. Mark has built the whole of the tradition around the theme of secrecy so that the theme appears as necessary to a presentation of the historical presupposition of the Gospel. It is not conceivable as an explanation of history which fitted Jesus' intentions, but it fits the actual relation between history and the Gospel. How far historical development was in accord with Jesus' expectations is difficult enough to conjecture, but how far this is so with respect to theological development is beyond the bounds of conjecture.

Matthew's alteration of the Marcan structure, which is achieved largely through the alteration of the theme of secrecy, must also be taken seriously, together with the reasons for it. He had no more reliable historical source, but rearranged and added to the material in accordance with a different understanding of the life of Jesus in the light of the Gospel. The material he uses shows no independent evidence of secrecy in Jesus' lifetime and it takes its sense from its use in the gospel itself. Matthew still shows awareness of a historical secret about Jesus' messiahship, but he reinterprets it in terms of historical concealment. Jesus' messiahship was known to the disciples but no-one else, and their understanding of it developed with the history. This was a fact which Matthew interprets theologically. The Gospel has as its content and basis the life of Jesus the Messiah, whose messiahship was revealed to the church, but historically concealed. Because of this historical understanding of the secret, as a factor within history itself, the Marcan theme had to be rationalized. In Mark it had been rather confused because of the historical form of the work. Matthew has systematized it within the historical form, and tidied it up. But, in doing so, he has placed more emphasis on the history itself. But Matthew was more concerned with a theological presentation of history than with a straightforward historical account. Indeed he

may have objected to the secret in Mark as being a rather artificial device, in preference for a theological understanding of history, of a history in which the one confessed rightly as Messiah by Peter (xvi. 13-20) was rejected. That Jesus was the Messiah was something which was not accepted, and it was inappropriate to speak of it (xvi.20). The nature of Matthew's understanding of history demanded a historicizing style, to show how history lay at the heart of the Gospel. But yet the Gospel expounds what was not evident from history itself, hence the emphasis on secret revelation (xiii. 10-17, xvi. 17, xi. 25-27), and on the historical Jesus as the meek and unimposing servant of the Lord (xii. 18-20).

Matthew historicizes, but he does not historicize the Gospel. His intention was to stress the importance to the Gospel of the historical Jesus in historical terms. He did not see the historical Jesus as a problem in the way Mark did, though the Jews' rejection of Jesus was a problem for him. It is the latter fact which qualified Jesus' life for Matthew, whilst at the same time he saw Jesus as in fact the Messiah. He would not, however, accept the Marcan secrecy-theme as it stood in Mark because for him it would suggest the wrong idea that Jesus purposely concealed his messiahship without reason. For him it was concealed

because of men's own hardness of heart (xiii.13). For the same reason presumably it will remain concealed till the parousia. Also Matthew had to say that the disciples did perceive Jesus' messiahship (see xiii. 16f). But their inadequacy was recognized, as it is in the church since. Matthew's different interpretation of history necessitated the alteration of Mark's theme of secrecy.

Matthew placed emphasis on the positive revelation in the historical fact of Jesus, though its non-acceptance by the Jews required some conception of concealment. His life was seen as part of an eschatological process behind history, which will have its outcome and explanation in the events of apocalyptic. It involves the judgment and division of mankind, which will be declared at the last day (xiii. 37ff., xxv. 31ff.). There is no particular problem for Matthew about the life of Jesus that is not part of the problem of all history (though this is to some extent true for Mark as well). But Matthew emphasizes the period of Jesus' earthly life (whereas Mark merely stresses his historicity). His life was the period in history which holds the key to all history (rather than just the presupposition of the Gospel as for Mark). The Gospel has to declare the meaning of this period of history. It is the 'heilige Vergangenheit', the decisive period of history for all time, the time of decision (xxvii. 25), the time with regard to which decision must be

made. For Matthew, Jesus' life was parabolic in that it illustrates how human life in history is qualified by the decision which must be made with regard to Jesus. Jesus was, almost literally, the rejected Messiah (xvi.20). For Matthew, the confrontation between Jesus and the Jews had to be a real one. Matthew did not, like Mark, see a contrast between the historical Jesus and Jesus as proclaimed by the Gospel, but he saw a contrast in the historical figure of Jesus himself between his appearance and his true nature as it will be revealed in the future. Mark's dialectic of concealment and revelation between history and the Gospel became, in Matthew, concealed revelation in history, witnessed to by the church in the Gospel. The demands of the Gospel are made in terms of the life of Jesus, presenting the challenge of history, to come to a decision about Jesus.

Important for this understanding of Matthew is the work of Georg Strecker³. Strecker takes very seriously the fact that in the redaction of the synoptic gospels both form and content show concern with the historical Jesus⁴. As Bornkamm pointed out⁵ the gospels contain not only a message ('Botschaft'), but also a narrative ('Bericht'). The delay in the parousia resulted in a concern with the past as well as the future,

and in particular with the past history of Jesus' life⁶. Fundamental to an understanding of the theology of any of the evangelists is the relation in their work between the historical and the eschatological. This has been ~~seen~~ in Mark in that Jesus' eschatology was interpreted in christological terms with reference to Jesus himself; this was the 'mystery of the kingdom of God'. The other synoptic gospels join together the historical and the eschatological in their accounts of the historical Jesus, in a way which has lead to the description of what they contain as 'Heilsgeschichte'⁷.

Strecker demonstrates, from the use of proof-texts, and from the chronological, geographical and other references in the gospel, Matthew's interest in the historical reference of the Gospel to Jesus.⁸ The period of Jesus' life is the presupposition of that Gospel as a 'heilige Vergangenheit' - a sacred piece of past history which is decisive for what follows.⁹ The majesty of the earthly Jesus is the theme. The significance of history is seen in terms of eschatology. A single Gospel of and about Jesus joins together both past and present. Matthew's christology transcends the merely historical level because it is related to an eschatological understanding of the meaning of history based on the significance of the person of the historical Jesus.¹⁰

This means that the Gospel is not historicized as merely the equivalent of a life of Jesus. Profane history is distinguished from 'Heilsgeschichte' - i.e. the eschatological is historicized in being made dependent on time, just as history is no more viewed in the categories of profane history but acquires an eschatological quality; both aspects become expressions of one and the same understanding of history in that the life of Jesus is included in the category of 'Heilsgeschichte', in which understanding of history a linear historical sequence becomes one with the eschatological and soteriological significance of time.¹¹ The miracles, as signs of the presence of God's reign, are indicative of the presence of the kingdom in the summons of Jesus¹². There is an ambiguous attitude to history in that there is what actually happened (e.g. the crucifixion) and also a significance which transcends the historical situation. The story of the Lord is told as eschatological event¹³, and, as such, the account of Jesus' words and deeds has importance and relevance¹⁴. The kingdom is historicized and the eschatology realised in so far as history is viewed as 'Heilsgeschichte', from the presence of Jesus within history.

It is now possible to see from Strecker's insight

into Matthew's understanding of his work and what it contains how and why Matthew altered Mark's theme of the messianic secret. Mark had seen a parallel between the relation of both eschatology and christology to history in the person of the historical Jesus. The Gospel revealed the 'mystery of the kingdom of God' and the secret of Jesus' identity jointly, in a dialectical relation to history, on the basis of a new understanding of Jesus' person gained from the passion and resurrection; in this way both the eschatological mystery and the christological secret could be seen as part of the history itself, in Jesus' lifetime prior to the passion; that history was therefore the presupposition of the Gospel, but in an account of that history it had to be made clear that the Gospel came later - hence the joint themes of secrecy and lack of understanding, prior to the passion and resurrection, set in relation to the passion and resurrection as future events, and hence, too, the dependence of eschatological expectation and christological definition on those events, as illustrated in the accounts of Peter's 'confession' and denial, of the transfiguration, and of Gethsemane, with Mk. xiii pointing to the future eschatological and christological expectation of the church.

Matthew's understanding of history took account of these aspects of the relation between the Gospel and history, and his narrative, which was constructed on the basis of that understanding, could not therefore contain either the commands to silence, as Mark understood them or the disciples' lack of understanding. The former were historicized and the latter was omitted, or changed into the disciples' 'little faith.' In place of the Marcan themes, there is the theme of concealment within the history itself. Eschatological summons is historicized in the person of Jesus himself within history. But this significance of Jesus' person had to be perceived by the disciples as the germ of the church. Neither eschatology nor christology were realized and fulfilled in history in that we still have a history to look back on and Jesus' messiahship was historically rejected and is still not evident from plain history. The eschatological significance of the continuing historical process and of Jesus' life within history will be made plain at the completion of that process in apocalyptic revelation. Historical sequence will give way to apocalyptic event, which will reveal the significance of history in terms of Jesus' judgement of the nations.

Matthew's alterations of Mark are therefore explicable

on the basis of his different presentation of the relation between history and the Gospel in respect of eschatology and christology, and his different understanding of his task as a writer. He was more concerned with the fact that he was writing about Jesus' life and historical existence in the scheme of the Gospel, within the historical process in which the Gospel is revealed. Whereas Mark had little or no interest in history itself, and only in the historical Jesus as proclaimed by the Gospel, Matthew stresses the history which is responsible for the Gospel, even though it cannot take the place of the Gospel. Thus he stresses the revelation within history that Jesus is the Christ, though he agrees that Jesus never allowed this to be made known as a purely historical fact (xvi. 20, xvii. 9). After the resurrection it could be made known by the Gospel as something demanding faith, despite what happened to Jesus historically. The revelation came to the disciples, historically, as a special privilege (xiii. 16f., xvi. 17ff.), not granted to others because of the hardness of their hearts (xiii. 13ff.). The presupposition of Matthew, as well as of Mark, is that Jesus' messiahship was not historically evident, because it was not a purely historical fact and was linked with Jesus' eschatological expectation, though it was never proclaimed by Jesus himself, but also

that Jesus is none other than the Messiah on the basis of an understanding of history and eschatology, and of his place in both, which depends on his historical existence and is proclaimed by the Gospel.

But the presentation of Jesus' life is different in each gospel, as is reflected in the different treatment of the tradition and in the different use of interpretative devices and the different significance of motifs such as secrecy. Matthew recognized Mark's secrecy-theme for what it was and only retained it at a different level and with less force, but he took account of what it was meant to witness to in other ways. He did not object to what it signified but could not use it for that purpose because it would not fit his own stress on history nor his historicizing style, unless it was taken purely as an aspect of history and used as a historical device in the story, so that Jesus refuses to let things be said in his lifetime, and the disciples were shown as not always sufficient for the revelation vouchsafed to them. In this way the tension in the Marcan narrative between history and the Gospel is relieved, and a smoother account is the result. But there remains a tension within the history itself. Matthew was aware that he was writing a special account of history, on the basis of church belief, against the opposing understanding

of the Jews. He wrote from the context of the opposition between church and synagogue, with the result that his gospel is apologetic and argumentative in tone. His concern with the historical Jesus is the result of this background and this background is the explanation of why it was necessary for him to rewrite Mark, and to stress more positively the significance of Jesus' life and death in relation to the preaching of the church, the existence of which depended on that life and its significance (xvi.18).

Detailed exegesis must establish this understanding of Matthew's gospel with regard to the theme of secrecy.

References for Chapter Three

Section 'A'

- ¹Das Messiasgeheimnis pp. 151ff.
- ²Der verborgene Menschensohn in den Evangelien.
- ³Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit. Untersuchung zur Theologie des Matthäus. Göttingen 1962.
- ⁴ibid p.46.
- ⁵'Evangelien', R.G.G. 3rd edition, II p. 750.
- ⁶Strecker ibid p.45.
- ⁷Strecker ibid p.48.
- ⁸ibid pp. 49ff.
- ⁹ibid p. 122.
- ¹⁰ibid pp. 129-130.
- ¹¹Strecker ibid p. 185.

¹²ibid p. 171.

¹³ibid p. 185.

¹⁴ibid p.185.

(B) Exegetical analysis of Matthew's gospel.

Discussion of Mark was necessary in an enquiry into the theme of the messianic secret because it is a characteristic of his gospel and one which influences the whole book. This is not the case with Matthew. But in Matthew the elimination or alteration of the theme of secrecy is a major part of Matthew's rewriting of Mark and because of this should be of significance for the construction of Matthew's gospel as a whole. The reasons for Matthew's alteration of the Marcan secrecy-theme in his rewriting of Mark should therefore be of interest in themselves for the whole book. Because of this, the following discussion will be concerned with Matthew's gospel as a whole as well as those parts in which he has altered or used Mark. Thereby a particular Matthean concept of concealment will become apparent. To say that Matthew rejects the Marcan theme is a simplification, as his important interpretative additions to those passages where it appears in Mark demonstrate.

The theme has interpretative significance for the redactional work of each of the evangelists and is of significance for the question of the relation between the tradition used and the history behind it. It has implications

for the historical question about Jesus' messiahship¹

Its use demonstrates the nature of the gospels themselves as descriptions of the historical Jesus and accounts of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, as well as the kerygmatic character of the historical tradition behind them. But it also shows the importance to the evangelists of the historical Jesus, despite every qualification, and whilst wrong approaches are ruled out. In this way the gospels will be seen as complementary, whereas the older methods of exegesis inevitably showed them as contradictory. This interpretation has the advantage over Sjöberg in that he set the gospels over against 'authentic' tradition and was only concerned to find out whether the secrecy-theme was 'authentic' to the tradition and itself historical. On the basis of the methodology employed here that approach is unnecessary and wrong-headed, yet the conclusion that Jesus' messiahship was actually concealed in the history is the same². But it is the gospels which demonstrate this and explain it. This approach shows, too, a greater significance of the secrecy-theme for the above contention than the view of it as a factor in history which was willed by Jesus, because it asserts more forcefully that Jesus was the Messiah and is the Son of Man, despite every appearance to the contrary. This is the importance of the theme in the

gospel of Mark, and of its reinterpretation in Matthew. The gospels deal with history, not just relate it. It is the gospels that are of concern, not history. Sjöberg makes the gospels a problem, whereas they are of prime significance in their treatment of history and the tradition in different ways. This is what Wrede did not take into account in his analysis which stopped short at asserting an opposition between dogma and history in the present form of the gospels. He stressed an unmessianic tradition, probably reflecting an unmessianic life of Jesus which was being transformed into a messianic one, when in fact Mark was concerned not to present a historical picture of Jesus as the Messiah, although historically he died on a false charge and the tradition declares him to be the Messiah. Each of the evangelists find difficulty with history in one way or another, although they are concerned in their writing with the historical Jesus. This is true of Matthew as well as Mark, and he shows no desire to write a messianic life of Jesus, but rather to fit the facts of Jesus' life with belief in his messiahship. His gospel is in that way a reflection on the life of Jesus from the point of view of the Gospel³

References for Chapter Three

Section 'B'

¹ that Jesus was not the expected Messiah, but that his messiahship must be understood in a new way as a result of the passion and resurrection.

² cf. Sjöberg op. cit. pp. 215ff.

³ cf. Schniewind Das Evangelium nach Matthäus. Göttingen 1936, 1960, p.1.

(i) The genealogy of history of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham, - Mtt. i. 1ff.

There is a problem about Mtt. i. 1, similar to that about Mk. i.1. This is whether the verse is a title to a section (i. 2-17) or to the whole book. Connected with it is the problem of the meaning of the opening phrase and in particular of the second word. The phrase βίβλος γενέσεως is Septuagintal (see Gen. ii.14, v.1, and cf. vi. 9, x. 1, xi. 10, 27, xxxvii. 2, Ruth iv. 18 for the use of the phrase αὐται αἱ γενέσεις. αὐται αἱ γενέσεις can signify either 'genealogy' (Gen. vi. 9) or 'history' (Gen. xxxvii. 2), with shades of meaning between the two¹. There is a close relation of meaning and usage between that phrase and the one in Matthew. At Gen. ii. 4 the phrase seems to signify 'history of origins', at Gen. v.1 'genealogy'. The Old Testament genealogies are, however, lists of descendants not of ancestors. The phrase in Mtt. i. 1 could embrace either the book or just the genealogy following and cover the relation between Jesus Christ (virtually a proper name, as at Mk. i. 1) and past history and his own setting in history. Mtt. i.1 does not show the same usage as the Old Testament. The emphasis is on the descendant not the progenitor² and fits the genealogy into a context where the interest throughout is with the

historical setting of Jesus Christ, his relation to all history, past and future.

i. 1 is in fact secondary to the genealogy and is used to fit the genealogy into the gospel as a whole. This is evident from the fact that the genealogy itself starts with Abraham and moves forward to Jesus called Christ (V.16). Matthew's placing of this genealogy at the beginning of his book meant that it needed an introduction³ and that the book needed an introduction to show the point of the genealogy with regard to it. i.1 contains two names which provide (as Büchsel says)¹, the numerical structure of the genealogy, but they also show the significance of the genealogy for the book as a whole, in that they set Jesus in line with the ethnic and political history of the Jewish people and its theological-racial-political aspirations. This interest is consistent with the evangelist's view of history and of Jesus' significance for history from a theological point of view. This view is made plain by Jesus' setting within and with regard to Jewish history as a turning-point in that history. Jesus could not have had a better pedigree to be called Christ, or Messiah, and was fitted to embody Jewish aspiration in the way that the Messiah should. The evangelist will present his life as the fulfilment of those aspirations (see his use of proof-texts and xiii.16f.) and will give an account of Jesus'

life as the culmination and central point of what Strecker⁴ calls the 'Heils- and 'Unheilsgeschichte', the fulfilment and point of reference of both prophecy and eschatology⁵. Jesus was the Messiah within history. But there is a tension within the history itself between this view of history and profane history, which is a question of belief or unbelief (see xiii. 11ff.). i.1 fits the genealogy into the gospel and relates the gospel to the genealogy, by reason of its ambiguous meaning.

The title shows that for Matthew the Gospel was rooted in the history of Jesus, whilst for Mark it was rooted in the person of Jesus, viewed from the standpoint of the resurrection, from which the period of Jesus' life is the ἀρχή of the Gospel, i.e. its presupposition. But Matthew does not equate the Gospel with an account of Jesus' life, since a special account of that life is required, nor make it contemporary with Jesus, since the life of Jesus must be part of past history. The Gospel belongs to the church (Mtt. xvi. 16ff.), and is connected with Jesus' life by the faith and eschatological commitment of Jesus' disciples. The connection is eschatological, not chronological,⁶ though it is within history and in a continuing relationship with Jesus to be consummated at the end of time (xxviii.20).

The primal significance of the event of Jesus for all history is illustrated in both Mark and Matthew by the verbal reference in the opening verse of each to Genesis.

The primary meaning of Mtt. i. 1 is undoubtedly 'genealogy' or 'history of the origin' of Jesus Christ, but its significance cannot be confined to the genealogy alone.⁷ It is too special an introduction to be confined to the genealogy alone,⁸ especially if the genealogy itself has significance for the whole book. Its primary reference is, however, to the genealogy and it does not mean simply 'history'.⁹ But it is, together with the genealogy, a key to the interpretation of the gospel as a whole. Fenton¹⁰ sees the verse as telescopic in character with an ultimate meaning which includes eschatology. Marxsen¹¹ regards the verse as a heading for the gospel as a book about Jesus' life and teaching which contains the Gospel, an aetiological account of the proclamation of the church. It almost describes the book as a collection of Jesus' 'Evangelien'.¹² This view hardly seems justified. For Matthew the Gospel is what Jesus proclaimed and has him as its content¹³. It is not an account of his life and preaching. i.1 is simply placed at the beginning with reference to the genealogy and to its significance for the evangelist's view of history in relation to the life of Jesus in particular.

That life was for Matthew, as for Mark, the presupposition for the Gospel.

The life of Jesus is presented as the life of the Messiah, the son of David, the son of Abraham. But Matthew is as conscious as Mark of the difficulties of that presentation, because of the facts of history. Matthew emphasizes the historical rejection of Jesus more forcefully than Mark. The messianic secret is for Matthew in the history itself. This fact is to be included in any statement that Matthew emphasizes history in his presentation of Jesus and of the basis of the Gospel. Matthew's presentation of Jesus as the rejected son of David has the same effect as Mark's of Jesus as the hidden Son of God. Here Matthew has developed something already found in Mark's passion narrative.

References for Chapter Three

Section (i)

- ¹cf. Büchsel in TWNT I p. 682 γένεσις .
- ²cf. Lohmeyer-Schmauch Das Evangelium des Matthäus Göttingen 1958. p.4, n.1.
- ³see Büchsel op. cit. p. 682.
- ⁴op. cit. p. 122.
- ⁵Strecker ibid p. 188.
- ⁶see Strecker ibid pp. 129-130.
- ⁷v. Lohmeyer-Schmauch op.cit. p.4, Strecker ibid p.53, n.1.
- ⁸Schniewind op. cit. p.9.
- ⁹v. Schniewind op. cit. p. 9, preceded by Zahn and Klostermann; Zahn translates it as 'Book of the history' see Arndt and Gingrich Lexicon p. 154.
- ¹⁰St. Matthew London 1963 p. 35f.
- ¹¹Der Evangelist Markus pp. 94f.

¹²Marxsen ibid pp. 93f.

¹³Strecker op. cit. p. 129.

(ii) The birth of Jesus Christ, - Mtt. i. 18ff, ii.

In ii 18ff. the actual γένεσις - birth - of Jesus Christ in history is described. This is the historical outcome at the end of the genealogy (cf. V. 16), and of prophecy (V.23). The whole of Israel's history has its culmination in the time of Christ (V. 17), ie. Jesus, the son of Joseph and Mary. Prophecy must be literally fulfilled in that Mary was a virgin (Is. vii. 14), and God is present with his people (i. 23). For Matthew this signifies the presence of the eschatological in Jesus¹, the coming to fulfilment in history of God's purposes for his people. It is announced to the contemporary ruler that the king of the Jews has been born (ii.2). The other side of the picture becomes already apparent in Herod's seeking to kill Jesus. The king of the Jews was rejected at birth as well as in death.

Matthew stresses the 'facts' about the historical Jesus, the circumstances and place of Jesus' birth and accompanying phenomena as fulfilments of prophecy (ii. 6). But the fact of the birth itself matters above all (i. 16, 18a, ii. 2a). The actual birth is the ground for enquiry about prophecy (ii. 5f.), which explains the birth. The question which the prophecy answers is that about where the

Messiah should be born. The history of Jesus is to be understood in accordance with the expectations of the Old Testament, though it is alongside and part of the movement of ordinary human history. Jesus is king of the Jews in a way not apparent on the basis of historical observation alone, but it is a hidden fact of history. The Jews reject Jesus and are rejected by God in a way which has observable historical results. Jesus' messiahship can be tested in history, but is only evident to faith by the revelation of God (cf. xvi. 17ff.). But the life of Jesus is the culmination of God at work in history (ii.23, understood in dynamic not static terms). Through Jesus it is true for the church until the end of time since Jesus is now the exalted and ever-present Lord (xviii. 20, xxviii. 18, 20b). This is the once-for-allness of Jesus' historicity; promise and fulfilment are conjoined in this piece of history. The eschatological orientation of Matthew's account of Jesus' life will become more evident later in the gospel, but it ensures that Matthew does not stress this piece of history for its own sake. Jesus' messiahship is concealed in the way the kingdom of God is concealed in his preaching (xi.12). They are concealed in so far as apprehension of them depends on response (xii. 13), but they are not openly revealed

(xi. 25ff., xvi. 17). The church is built on apprehension in faith of Jesus' identity (xvi. 18). Matthew has schematized Mark's understanding of the lack of historical proof of Jesus' identity, apprehension of which is based on faith in the Gospel, in that Matthew saw Jesus' life as part of a divine plan, embracing the history of the Jewish people, the life of Jesus, and the time of the church, up to the end of history and the revelation of the Son of Man (xxiii. 39, xxiv. 30). For Matthew the Gospel proclaims that the time has come in Jesus' life, i.e. the decisive event of eschatological fulfilment has taken place in history, whilst Mark is more concerned with the Gospel as the proclamation of Jesus' person, accepted in faith, as the realization of the Gospel of the kingdom which is not realized in history. For Mark the latter fact meant that there was secrecy during Jesus' lifetime until the coming of the Gospel, whilst for Matthew the secrecy was there in the history and preaching themselves and the Gospel was implicit in them. A different emphasis demanded a different presentation. Matthew stresses the history as part of the fulfilment of God's purposes, though they remain concealed in that history.

In Mtt. i and ii Jewish prophecy and Gentile searching of the heavens for a clue to the fate of the nations are shown as finding their fulfilment in Jesus' birth. Place

of birth and natural phenomena coincide to fit this 'fact'. Even the fact that the Christ is the man from Nazareth is viewed as part of the divine plan (ii. 23)². This ordinary and mundane fact is caught up in the deeper significance which surrounds Jesus' life. The historical character of Jesus' existence opens its significance to contradiction. This is evident in history in the Jewish rejection of Jesus, which is forshadowed in the action of Herod. There are two levels of interpretation of the historical as far as Jesus is concerned, but they are both dependent on the actual historicity of Jesus. This develops the presentation of the historical Jesus in Mark, but the tension there between history and the Gospel has become in Matthew a synthesis by reason of his dual attitude to history.

References for Chapter Three

Section (ii)

¹cf. Strecker op. cit. p. 213.

²cf. Strecker op. cit. pp. 61ff.

(iii) Jesus and John the Baptist, - Mtt. iii lff.

From chapter iii it is possible to compare Matthew more directly with Mark and to see the particular emphasis of Matthew over against Mark. Mark's concept of the origin of the Gospel as the concern of his gospel has already been transposed by an emphasis on the historical origin of Jesus, in the first two chapters. Mark's preoccupation with the relationship between Gospel and history, and between the Gospel of and the Gospel about Jesus Christ, has been transformed in that the historical aspect is seen as included in the evangelical. This means that Matthew had a more integrated view of the nature of what he was writing. He was writing an account of the history at the heart of the Gospel, not presenting the dialectical relationship between history and Gospel. Jesus' life is the central point of history, on the basis of which the Gospel is possible within history. From it we can look back to prophecy as well as forward to eschatological fulfilment. The Gospel is part of the whole development within history, and reveals the truth about history on the basis of Jesus' presence in history. 'In those days' (ii. 1) it was possible for John as well as Jesus to proclaim the approach of the kingdom of heaven (see iii. 2 and iv. 17). The precise chronological following

of John by Jesus (iv. 12) seems to stress the repetition of the message. The message appears in Matthew as one which characterized the eschatological nature of the time, that it was already within the sphere of God's dynamic activity for which the activity of John was a sign, as well as that of Jesus (iii. 3, iv. 15f.). The prophecy is used differently from in Mark in that it characterizes the time, rather than just being part of the origin of the Gospel. The eschatological proclamation is used differently by Matthew in the same way in that it characterizes the time rather than being reinterpreted christologically by the Gospel. But it is affirmed that Jesus in history took up, guaranteed and reaffirmed the message of John the forerunner about the approach of Kingdom of heaven. Its repetition shows that it was a proclamation which could be made continually at that time and thereafter, on the basis of what was happening then. Matthew saw eschatology as continually coming to realization through the action of God in history through the person of Jesus - God with us. It is not just, as with Mark, that Jesus' eschatological preaching or Gospel makes sense on the basis of the Gospel's proclamation of Jesus. Matthew stresses the actual fulfillment then. The baptism of Jesus in Matthew is also not a

private designation of Jesus outside history, but the first occasion when Jesus is proclaimed by God to be his Son, and when Jesus begins to fulfil his destiny (iii. 15, 17 - note the third person designation). John too recognizes his superior (iii.14).

Matthew has developed from Mark, using other, possibly older, material, the differentiation and relation between the historical work and function of John and Jesus in relation to the coming of the kingdom of Heaven, but whilst Mark stresses the christological implications of their relationship in John's preceding Jesus, Matthew stresses the historical relation in its eschatological implications in Jesus' following John. Mark is concerned with theological priorities, Matthew with chronological priority. Matthew has drawn on older tradition which stressed the relation between John and Jesus functionally (see iii. 11f., and V.3) - that it is independent, possibly older, tradition is shown by comparison with Lk. iii. 7ff. & VV. 3ff. and Mk. i. 7 & VV. 2f. - but Mark has influenced it in its use by the other evangelists). There is a difference in quality between the proclamations of the kingdom by John and Jesus in part arising from the crucial movement of time and in part from the different function of the two figures. The nature of their relationship to

each other depends on the differing understanding of each evangelist about the relation between the eschatological proclamation and history. Mark sees the relation in christological, Matthew in historical, terms. But there is in Matthew a christological understanding of the eschatological function of both John and Jesus in history; John's role is to demand repentance, Jesus' to initiate the judgement. This is plain in the difference between the two baptisms (see iii. 7ff.). The explanation of this is to be found in the identity of Jesus as proclaimed by the voice at the Baptism of Jesus by John. Thus the historical and eschatological relation between John and Jesus are understood by Matthew in terms of Jesus' identity, as the one who must fulfil all righteousness (iii.15). Of course it is plain that earlier tradition had already been concerned with the relation between John and Jesus in historical, eschatological and christological terms, (cf. too John's identification with Elijah, xi. 14. cf. ^{Mk.} Mtt. ix. 11ff.) but each evangelist has developed this in accordance with his understanding of the relation between history, eschatology, and christology. For Matthew eschatology is the inner truth of history which the activity of John and Jesus helped to realize and for which the historical Jesus

was and is a sign and summons, whilst for Mark the person of Jesus is the explanation of both history and eschatology. It is a difference of emphasis which causes a vast difference in treatment.

(iv) The historical Jesus - Mtt. iii. 13ff., iv. 1ff.

In effect this difference of emphasis results in a different treatment of the question as to who Jesus was in terms of what the Gospel says of who Jesus is. Mark presents the difficulties of answering the former question without the latter whilst Matthew emphasizes the answer which is possible to the former question on the basis of the latter. This is perhaps why Matthew has altered the messianic secret and made it a secret of the history itself, rather than something only understandable after the resurrection. It is in Matthew, as we shall see, a secret which the disciples do understand in Jesus' lifetime but in which they lack sufficient faith. The firm division and dialectic between history and Gospel in Mark which corresponded with Jesus' dialectical relationship with the world and history in eschatology, disappears in Matthew, in that the history of Jesus is taken up into eschatological process, understood from the presence of Jesus and his identity in history on the basis of the Gospel. What conceals is the history itself, and its inner truth is concealed from those without faith. This can be considered as a refinement, systematization, or softening of the Marcan picture, but it is not in opposition to Mark. Matthew makes the concealment the fault of men, softening the implication that it is the intention of

God (see xiii. 13ff. cf. Mk. iv. 11f.). Matthew had to take into account the fact of rejection, but refused to lay the responsibility with God. Mark too had emphasized the importance of faith, as well as the necessity that Jesus' life should be complete before the preaching of the Gospel. Matthew saw the Gospel as in fact preached in Jesus' lifetime, making more of the relation between Jesus' eschatological Gospel and the Gospel about Jesus. He does not stress Jesus' life as a period of concealment in the plan of salvation, since the concealment is a continuing factor until the last day. Matthew does not take so seriously the fact that the Gospel is a post-resurrection factor. But Matthew has only revised the presentation of Mark, unless he misunderstood it and thought he was altering it. Both gospels are two attempts to interpret the relation of the life of Jesus to the Gospel, recognizing the same structure in the relationship in that the Gospel explains Jesus' identity in a way which history on its own does not. Matthew both smoothes Mark out a little, and also softens its radical presentation of the relation between history and the Gospel. Thus whilst for Mark the cross was an inner necessity of history and a precondition for Jesus' being the Son of Man and hence for the Gospel,

for Matthew it was part of the historical rejection of the Messiah by the Jews in accordance with a historical pattern and the picture of a meek Messiah in scripture, a situation which will be reversed on the last day. The church now continues his mission, under his present Lordship over history which will be revealed in the future. For Matthew it is the church, for Mark the Gospel, which provides the link between the passion-resurrection and the parousia. The link is a historical one for Matthew, but, in each, the link extends Jesus' relation to eschatology into the present. Mark saw the Gospel as proclaiming its fulfilment and realization in Jesus' person by faith in Jesus, whilst Matthew saw the church as continuing the eschatological process in history, under the same eschatological pressure of the presence of God on account of Jesus. The concealment of Gospel and church in history is identical with that of Jesus himself, though they also witness to revelation in Jesus. Mark had the concept of the messianic secret, Matthew of what we might call 'Heilsgeschichte', an understanding of history itself on the basis of the eschatological and christological Gospel of and about Jesus Christ.

This presentation of Jesus begins with the account of his baptism by John, though this is coloured in Matthew

by the preceding nativity and infancy narrative. As in Mark Jesus' activity does not begin until that of John ends (iv.12) and this is stressed from a chronological point of view in Matthew. But the baptism and temptation narratives do seem to set the tone from the account which follows in a way which is not true in Mark. The baptism narrative in Matthew is Marcan with typically Matthaean alterations (VV. 14f.)¹, though the influence of oral tradition is not unlikely.² The concept of righteousness - δικαιοσύνη - and its alliance with that of fulfilment - πληρῶσαι - is Matthaean (cf. v. 17, 20, vi. 1). 'Righteousness' is what Jesus, followed by his disciples, achieves in history, beginning with his baptism. It demonstrates in history Jesus' Sonship (iii.17). The temptation narrative reveals wrong ways in which that Sonship might have been demonstrated, ways which Jesus rejected (iv. 1ff.) because they would have meant worshipping the devil instead of God. They are messianic temptations. Jesus' life represented an open rejection of them. This old 'Q' tradition, constructed out of scriptural quotations, fits the pattern of Jesus' life, and is used by Matthew to characterize it.

References for Chapter Three

Section (iv)

¹cf. Strecker op. cit. p. 150.

²Strecker op. cit. pp. 178ff.

(v) Jesus' eschatological preaching and activity in history, - Mtt. iv. 12ff.

The beginning of Jesus' preaching has a different significance in Matthew from Mark. It is described as precisely dependent on John's imprisonment (iv. 12), and as being in accordance with scripture (Vv. 14ff.). Its terms are, however, the same as those of John's preaching (V. 17, cf. iii. 2). Its historical setting is important in itself for Matthew (cf. xi. 11ff.), whilst in Mark the juxtaposition of the Gospel about and the Gospel of Jesus is more important. Schniewind¹ tries to avoid the difficulty that the preaching of John and of Jesus are in the same terms by rejecting the possibility of redaction and by asserting an internal difference on the grounds that Jesus is himself the content of the kingdom, the 'autobasileia'. But the differences between Matthew and Mark must be taken seriously as redactional differences. Even if they represent in some measure actual history it is inescapable that Matthew and Mark have recorded 'history' in different ways, and to different effect. Matthew probably did see a difference between the preaching of John and of Jesus, in part chronological and in part explicable from Jesus' presence in history. John was at the dividing line of history and Jesus, as the secondary preacher, just over it.

This is also explicable from a different characterization of each figure, one Elijah, the other the Messiah. But this is not plain in the preaching of either in itself. They are undifferentiated. But the concealment in history of the truth of the message of each, that the kingdom of heaven is at hand, is explicable in the concealment of the identity of each figure. John the Baptist and Jesus are together guarantors of the continuing relevance of their joint eschatological message in history. Their message is no longer seen as urgent, but rather as crucial for an understanding of history itself thereafter. Matthew has omitted from Jesus' preaching the statement about the fulfilment of time since he is concerned about the continuance of time; for Mark it is fulfilled in Jesus, as we see from the relation between present and future in the parables of Mk. iv. For Matthew fulfilment is a continuing process within history in respect of scripture and righteousness; history is part of eschatological fulfilment. After John the Baptist Jesus began to preach the nearness of the kingdom of heaven, but that preaching was not at the point of fulfilment. Jesus' life and activity were at the mid-point in time and crucial for all time. But his preaching at that time is crucial for the time in which we now find ourselves. That preaching is a 'light to lighten the Gentiles' (Vv. 15f.).

The summoning of disciples follows, as in Mark (VV.18ff.). Then comes a summary of Jesus' preaching and healing (VV.23ff.). The proclamation of Jesus is described by Matthew as 'the Gospel of the kingdom' (cf. ix. 35, xxiv. 14, for the fact that the phrase is Matthaean). This reveals another difference over against Mark, by comparison with Mk. i.1, 14f. The Gospel appears in Matthew as the eschatological preaching of Jesus. The present Gospel reinforces Jesus' own Gospel and is in turn guaranteed by his preaching of it. Matthew does not differentiate the two Gospels (see xxiv. 14). The Gospel covers both the period of Jesus' life and the time of the church, and had its beginning in the former. This is the point of the historical reflection of Matthew's gospel. For Matthew the Gospel actually began in Jesus' lifetime. From there we have a linear progression of what the Gospel proclaims. Mark was more conscious of a break between Jesus' Gospel and that of the Church, only bridged by the resurrection-faith in, and proclamation of, Jesus' messiahship. For Mark, the eschatological questioning of history was transformed into belief in Jesus' person despite history; for Matthew, Jesus' Gospel of the kingdom reinterprets history itself from his position within it. Jesus' both brought and was brought by the kingdom into

history, and guides history to its close in the completion of the kingdom. His role over against history will be disclosed to all on the last day, and this will also be the fulfilment of the working of the kingdom through history². The Gospel is the link between then and now, not as a historical development, but as a continuity grounded in eschatology, behind which is the one person of the Lord, Jesus of Nazareth³; Matthew's Christology has a strong eschatological aspect, and is rooted in Jesus' Gospel of the kingdom. From this it can be said that the kingdom makes its way in history, although still obstructed (Mtt.xi.12), and will arrive at the end of history with the return of Jesus himself. The precise formulation of the Gospel has varied because of the development in time, reflecting a development in the fulfilment of God's purposes and the nearer arrival of the kingdom of heaven. ~~The position of Jesus has varied because of the development in time, reflecting a development in the fulfilment of God's purposes and the nearer arrival of the kingdom of heaven.~~ The position of Jesus has varied too by the time we reach xxviii. 18, but the Gospel joins together Jesus as he then was and Jesus as he now is and makes it possible for Matthew to write his gospel. At least that is how Matthew, as distinct from Mark, justified his writing of it. Some justification of it was needed by

both evangelists and Matthew was clearly not satisfied with Mark's, for him, too negative approach. But the intention of both was to maintain the place of the historical Jesus with regard to the Gospel. Matthew maintains it with reference to eschatology, but recognizes the historical concealment of Jesus' identity, as of the present working of the kingdom.

VV. 23-25 represent Mk. i. 39, iii. 7-10, and involve the omission here of Mk. i. 21-39 as a unit, though Mk. i. 29-34 appears at Mtt. viii. 14-17. Mk. i. 22 appears at Mtt. vii. 28b, 29, with reference to the discourse preceding. Mk. i 40ff. then follows in Mtt. viii 2ff.

References for Chapter Three

Section (v)

¹ op. cit. pp. 34f.

² cf. Strecker op. cit. pp. 128ff., 166ff.

³ Strecker op. cit. pp. 129f.

(vi) The teaching of Jesus the Messiah and the fulfilment of righteousness, - Mtt. v-vii.

Matthew expresses the significance of Jesus' teaching in terms of his task (v. 17ff.) and that of his disciples (v.6, 10, 13ff., 20ff., 48., vi. 1ff., 33, vii. 12, 20, 21ff., 24ff.) as being the fulfilment of all righteousness. This is the construction of Matthew (cf. Lk. vi. 20ff.). Matthew's contention is that Jesus performed this task and in this fact is his own significance evident in history. As Käsemann says¹, only the Messiah could have taken up the attitude to the law expressed here. Matthew's claim is that in that Jesus did achieve this relationship to the law he fulfilled the law. This describes his historical significance and justifies any further description of him. But, of course, precisely this attitude to the law was historical cause for offence, but now it is the justification for the Christians radicalizing of the law in terms of a 'better righteousness' than the scribes and Pharisees. This is christologically grounded, and based on Jesus' own attitude to the law. His deeds will be shown to fit with his words, and to have the same significance. The need for deeds to match words is strongly affirmed in this discourse (vii. 20ff.). In all this we are meant to behold the 'authority' of Jesus,

above that of the scribes (vii.29).

The latter verse has been taken over from Mark and used afresh. In Mark it was used to raise the historical question about Jesus' identity, which history suggested but did not answer. Matthew stresses the evidence for Jesus' authority in history, though it was not recognized, partly because it was too striking. His authority lay, not in superseding the law, nor in instituting a new one, but in fulfilling it, like his fulfilment of scripture and of all righteousness². The law validates Jesus' teaching and messianic authority -
 ἐξουσία - rather than that of the Pharisees and
 scribes.

References for Chapter Three

Section (vi)

¹ Exegetische Versuche I pp. 206ff., Essays pp. 37ff.

² cf. Bornkamm p. 35 and Barth pp. 153ff. in Bornkamm-Barth-Held Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew.

(vii) The works of Jesus, the Messiah, -Mtt. viii. 1- ix. 34.

After demonstrating Jesus' authority from his words, Matthew does the same from his deeds (cf. ix. 6). Significantly the first miracle in Matthew is that of the cleansing of the leper (viii. 2-4). Stress is laid on the indirect witness of the cultus to Jesus (V.4) and on Jesus' making and declaring the leper clean. Extraneous items have been omitted, e.g. Jesus' anger and the leper's probable disobedience. The leper's appearance before the priest is not taken to be in any sense a declaring clean but a witness to a cleansing which has already taken place (cf. Mtt. VV. 3f., with Mk. i. 42, 44). The command to silence must be taken in a historical sense in connection with the command to go to the priest. The Marcan secrecy-theme is not involved simply by the inclusion of the command to silence here. The fact that in Matthew Jesus is not alone (see V.1) does not make the command senseless¹, but it does indicate that it has only a secondary meaning to the command following it. Matthew is concerned not to suggest disobedience on the part of the leper, since that would emphasize the command to silence in a way not intended by him and detract from the central significance of the witness

of the cultus. The miracle is known in history and witnesses to Jesus' authority, but that authority is still not perceived. This is the implication of Matthew's account. The witness of the cultus will condemn unbelief at the judgment. Its witness leaves men without excuse (cf. the extension of the simple phrase, as it appears in Mark, at Mtt. x. 18, xxiv. 14 with regard to the preaching of the Gospel to all the nations before the end). The phrase seems to refer in Matthew to the witness given to men in preparation for the judgment. This is an extension of the Marcan usage (see Mk. i. 44, vi. 11, xiii. 9), which had a condemnatory sense.

The following pericope also demonstrates Jesus' authority (Vv. 9f., 13). The centurion's faith in Jesus stands in contrast to the unbelief of Israel (see Vv. 11f., which Lk. xiii. 28-30 shows to have been originally independent of this pericope) which is a major theme in Matthew. vii 14f., 16 from Mk. i. 29ff., 32ff. bring the first group of miracle-stories to a close, ending with a reference to the fulfilment of scripture (V.17). Reference to forbidding the demons to speak (Mk. i. 34) is omitted as a Marcan motif which did not appeal to Matthew - cf. his constant omission of it, the most obvious example being Mtt. xii. 15b, 16, cf. Mk. iii. 12.

It is already apparent that Matthew's treatment of miracles is different from that of Mark, but with roughly the same purpose. Mark played down the miracles in themselves as in no way to be used as historical proof of who or what Jesus was, and surrounded them with elements of secrecy, disobedience and lack of understanding. Matthew presents the miracles as evidence for Jesus' authority and identity on the basis of the witness of law and prophecy-see his emphasis on the witness of the cultus in the cleansing of the leper². As Held says,³ the healing of the leper has become in Matthew much more of a paradigm and is accentuated in a christological direction. The subsequent behaviour of the man does not interest Matthew because he is solely concerned with Jesus' command as 'an attestation of himself'. The issue of faith and unbelief is stressed in VV. 10-12, and in V.17 reference is made to the fulfilment of scripture. This all shows that the evidence of the miracles is not direct in itself. Jesus' miracles are shown to be the works of the Messiah in the same way as his sayings are shown to be the words of the Messiah, by the law and the prophets⁴. Matthew's historicizing style is not to place most emphasis on bare history, but to draw attention to the indirect witness involved in the history.

The historical Jesus is shown to be the Messiah in word and deed⁵, and can be addressed in faith as Lord (VV.2,8). The Gospel is a bridge between Jesus' preaching and activity and that of the church and is historically related to both. Jesus' words and deeds are taken up into the kerygma of the church. In all this Matthew presupposes the work of Mark as well as the form of the kerygma. The life of Jesus can be preached, as well as being presupposed by the Gospel. Mark has made it possible for Matthew to advance to this stage. There is no inconsistency despite the fact that Matthew has perhaps disregarded the radical otherness of history over against the Gospel and faith, because he has taken the dialectic between them seriously, as something possible within history in continuity from Jesus himself. The Gospel preached by the church is thoroughly dependent on that of Jesus himself, in word and deed, and inseparable from it. Therefore one is included in the other, on one side implicitly, on the other explicitly.

The problem about history is for Matthew the problem about this particular history, the life of Jesus. One of the most striking parts of that problem is the unbelief of Israel. Mark does not deal with this problem; for him it is part of the historical offence of Jesus which the Gospel

alone can either dispel or sharpen. But for Matthew this is a problem of the history itself, which the Gospel only develops, and it can be treated with reference to history. Jesus can be shown to have been the Messiah by reference to the law and the prophets. But Matthew does not seek to demonstrate it simply by reference to history alone, since he recognizes the problem. Jesus is shown to be the Messiah in history by means of a particular understanding of history on the basis of the law and the prophets and of eschatology, so that the person of Jesus becomes the key to the whole of history.

The demands made on followers of Jesus are illustrated in viii. 18ff. (a 'Q' passage). This introduces concern with the question of discipleship and describes the condition of the earthly Jesus who summons disciples to follow him (V.20). Originally the Son of Man saying in V. 20 involved no conception of concealment⁶. The 'Q' saying speaks directly of Jesus in terms of the Son of Man and his condition of homelessness, unacknowledged by his contemporaries. This Son of Man is the one who summons men with authority. This is the authority of the earthly Jesus. The 'Q' saying has been taken from its kerygmatic context and placed in the context of Jesus' earthly life and here characterizes the earthly and historical Jesus with regard

to his followers. He is recognized and acknowledged by them though not by the world at large in history. To this extent the passage takes on a sense of concealment in the context of Matthew's gospel.

The next few miracle-stories are culled from different parts of Mark to illustrate the power and homelessness of Jesus, the Son of Man. Mtt. viii. 23ff. shows that Jesus is able to rescue one out of all the dangers involved in following him (V. 23). It has been correctly called a parable of discipleship.⁷ Lohmeyer thinks that the differences in the pericope over against Mark suggest an independent source.⁸ But the point of the miracle in Matthew is different from in Mark. The rearrangement of the dialogue between Jesus and his disciples, so that the rebuke for lack of faith precedes the miracle instead of following it (V.26), makes the disciples rather than the miracle itself the subject of the pericope⁹. The disciples are questioned about their little faith - ὀλιγόπιστοι ~~α-~~ is a favourite Matthaean word, see already vi.30. The men, not the disciples, as Schniewind thinks¹⁰, wonder what sort of man this is (V.27). Confidence in following Jesus is what is required, whilst the world looks on wondering. The emphasis is on Jesus' significance for his followers.

The next pericope (viii. 28ff.) follows, as in Mark, but is much abbreviated. The narrative is cut to the barest minimum, omitting unnecessary details in the miracle itself, the bargaining with the demon and the subsequent conversation with the demoniac. The emphasis is on Jesus himself¹¹. Jesus' power over demons is clearly demonstrated in the act of exorcism. This is the one example in Matthew of the demons' witness to Jesus' identity. Otherwise the reference is only general (iv. 24, viii. 16). The usual traits of the exorcism story are omitted to stress the unique authority of Jesus, which has an eschatological character (V. 29). Jesus is the One who will bring the demons to nought, but yet he is homeless on earth (V.34). The masterly authority of Jesus over demons stands in contrast with his earthly concealedness and homelessness. His earthly life was in anticipation of his future work and status (V. 29, which is not, as Lohmeyer thinks¹² the demons' mistake). This is the point of his earthly description as Son of Man - V. 20, cf. vii. 22f.

Matthew's use of the 'Q' Son of Man sayings in the context of a narrative about Jesus' life is a significant development in the use of the sayings. The context introduces of necessity the idea of concealment, in that Jesus' authority is not perceived in history although present.

He has consciously developed the conception of Jesus on earth as the Son of Man who would come again (see xiii. 37ff.). This development had been made possible by Mark. In 'Q' the sayings had declared the present relevance of Jesus' words on the basis of his authority as Son of Man. They were not purely historical descriptions of Jesus in those terms. We can compare Mk. ii. 10, 28 set over against narrative tradition. Matthew has made them direct references to the earthly and historical Jesus, and, therefore, the concept of concealment was necessary. The view of Ed, Schweizer¹³ that these sayings represent Jesus' ambiguous self-description suggests a meaningless paradox and extremely singular and eccentric behaviour, as well as being inaccurate. As a description of Jesus in terms of the Son of Man it is secondary. The secondary nature of this and other 'Q' sayings of the same kind is shown by the fact that in their present form they have no original connection with their present contexts and appear to be constructions to give christological meaning to those contexts. Each evangelist interprets them in accordance with his concern in the rest of the gospel. For Matthew the earthly Jesus was Son of Man by anticipation, and his identity and authority was 'ipso facto' concealed, apart from the disciples and the demons.

In ix. 1ff. Matthew uses Mk. 11. 1ff. to demonstrate further the earthly authority of the Son of Man in Jesus of Nazareth (V. 6, cf. Mk. ii. 10). He rearranges the Marcan wording to predicate ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς of the Son of Man - at least according to the readings which account for textual differences on the grounds of a differentiation between the evangelists and subsequent assimilation¹⁴. His apparently minor abbreviations of Mark, omission of the exhibition of faith (Mk. ii. 4) and of the explanation of the charge of blasphemy (Mk. ii. 7b) serve to place the emphasis on the power of Jesus here displayed and to subordinate the miracle-story to the inserted controversy and the statement in V. 6¹⁵. Matthew has drawn the pericope together more closely around this pronouncement as a direct designation of Jesus. Matthew's closing verse (V.8) establishes the interest of the account. This covers the fact that the same ἐξουσία is given to the disciples (xviii. 18) and explains the omission of Mk. ii. 7b. Lohmeyer thinks that V.8 is a misunderstanding¹⁶. But Matthew is not suggesting a secret in biographical terms arising from an ambiguous and misunderstood title. The title of Son of Man, as used of the earthly Jesus, has its full force. But V. 8 emphasizes that the christological

basis of the power which has been displayed is not evident to the world at large (cf. viii. 27). The historical difficulties of Jesus' uttering^{an} apparently open statement of his identity were not considered by Matthew, whose concern was not with historical situations in themselves. He was concerned with the presence of the Son of Man within history in Jesus of Nazareth, as part of his concern with the presence of the kingdom of heaven behind the events of history. Mark could not have conceived of the presence of the Son of Man within history, even though he did conceive of the passion of Jesus as the prior way by which the Son of Man had to go, but that was a christological understanding. For Matthew the miracle here recorded was a demonstration of the presence and power of the Son of Man, by which it was bestowed on men. He recognizes at the same time that this was denied. This authority is the basis for Jesus' being in the company of tax-collectors and sinners (VV. 12f. cf. xi. 19) which is also justified from scripture¹⁷. The more unified form of ix. 14ff. in Matthew stresses the presence of the bridegroom, and re-emphasizes the original eschatological significance of the saying in V. 15. in terms of the presence of Jesus.

In ix. 18ff. Matthew picks up another part of Mark on which he has already drawn and constructs a group of

three miracle-stories which has its emphasis on faith (ix. 22, 28f.). It is true that Matthew has omitted Mk. v. 36, but he has heightened the evidence of faith in the ruler at ix. 18¹⁸. Matthew omits the command to silence at Mk. v. 43 in preference for stress on the spreading of Jesus' fame. But the command in Mark could scarcely be understood historically and such commands were frequently followed by the reverse situation, practically as a dogmatic pattern (cf. Mk. vii. 36). Just as the Marcan commands to silence must be understood from a dogmatic point of view as reflecting actual secrecy in history over against the Gospel, so must the evidence of miracles in Matthew be set against the fact that the world at large appears as quite ignorant of Jesus' identity. The demands for faith, christologically understood, are what count.

The latter point is the main emphasis of Mtt. ix. 27-31, the last of this group. Comparison with Mtt, xx. 29-34 and Mk. x. 46ff. shows that it is a further use by Matthew of that Marcan pericope. Again there are two blind men and they use the title son of David, which is for Matthew a factual statement (see i. 1, 17, 20). The reference to faith is also dependent on Mark, though it is in a distinctively Matthaeian form, (cf. viii. 13), as is the introduction to the pericope¹⁹. There is no support for Lohmeyer's theory

that it belongs to a Galilean tradition about the concealed Son of Man.²⁰ The pericope is yet more compressed here than at xx. 29ff., except from the Matthaean mention of touching the blind men (ix. 29, xx. 34) and the stress on faith, omitted at xx. 29ff., which is the main emphasis here.²¹ The crowd's attempt to silence the men is omitted here (cf. Mk. x. 48, Mtt. xx. 31), but, at the end, the men are sent away with a strict charge to secrecy (V. 30) reminiscent of Mk. i. 43f. It is followed, as at Mk. i. 45, by disobedience (V. 31). Apart from faith the miracles are meaningless, and impossible (cf. Mtt. xiii. 58,)²². The reactions of bystanders in Matthew illustrate this point too (see viii. 27, 33f., ix. 8, 26, 33f.). VV. 32ff. bring the accounts of miracles to a close and show their christological significance.²³

VV. 32ff. are borrowed from the 'Q' introduction to the Bezebooul controversy (see Lk. xi. 14f., Mtt. xii. 22ff.). This and the previous pericope may also compensate for the omission of Mk. vii. 31ff., viii. 22ff. The inclusion of this passage here can only be in order to indicate the christological implications of the miracles. The authority of Jesus is what is in question, on the basis of quite unique events in the history of Israel (v. 33b)²⁴. V. 34 shows, however, the Messiah's hiddenness in Israel²⁵.

The signs are not necessarily perceived. The demands of faith have been stressed throughout this section in two ways, one with reference to the theme of 'following' Jesus, i.e. of discipleship (viii. 18ff., 23ff., ix. 9, 27), the other with regard to the authority of Jesus in healing (viii. 10, 13, ix. 2, 18, 22, 28f.). In each case the hidden 'authority' of Jesus as Son of Man (viii. 20, ix. 6) has been demonstrated, an authority exercised 'before the time' (viii. 29).

References for Chapter Three

Section (vii)

- ¹cf., for that view, Wrede Das Messiasgeheimnis p. 11.
- ²cf. Held op. cit. pp. 256f.
- ³op. cit. p. 257.
- ⁴cf. Held op. cit. p. 255.
- ⁵cf. Schniewind op. cit. pp. 37, 106.
- ⁶cf. Tödt Der Menschensohn pp. 112ff., as against Dibelius Jesus 1946 pp. 86ff.
- ⁷Bornkamm op. cit. pp. 52ff., Held op. cit. pp. 200ff.,.
- ⁸op. cit. p. 163.
- ⁹Held op. cit. p. 204.
- ¹⁰op. cit. p. 115.
- ¹¹Held op. cit. pp. 172ff.
- ¹²op. cit. p. 166.

¹³Der Menschensohn 'Z.N.W.' 50, pp. 185ff.

¹⁴cf. Aland Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum pp. 61, 125.

¹⁵see Held op. cit. pp. 175ff.

¹⁶op. cit. p. 169, cf. Schniewind op. cit. p. 118.

¹⁷see Held op. cit. p. 248.

¹⁸Held op. cit. p. 180, referring to Klostermann Das Matthäusevangelium Tübingen 1927 pp. 82ff. and Bacon Studies in Matthew. New York 1930. p. 193.

¹⁹Held op. cit. pp. 219f.

²⁰op. cit. pp. 178ff.

²¹cf. Held op. cit. pp. 223ff.

²²Held op. cit. pp. 276ff.

²³cf. Held op. cit. pp. 256ff.

²⁴cf Lohmeyer op. cit. p. 181.

²⁵cf. Schniewind op. cit. p. 124.

(vii) The mission of the disciples, Mtt. ix 35-xi 1.

Matthew's account of the call and sending out of the disciples is a collection comprising or representing Mk. iii. 13-19, vi. 7-11 and 'Q' material¹. They receive authority over unclean spirits (x. 1, cf. Mk. vi. 7) and will suffer the same fate as Jesus himself (x. 24f., 38). They are his representatives (x.40), and must continue his work and preaching (ix. 35ff., x.7, cf. iv. 17), the Gospel of the kingdom which he guarantees. They share too his homelessness in the world (x. 9ff.) in this period of transition (x.22b) before the coming of the Son of Man (x.23). The mission of the disciples is here given its point of termination, just as the coming of Jesus was its starting-point. Matthew makes no differentiation between Jesus then and in the future (x.32f).

References for Chapter Three

Section (vii)

¹Held op. cit. pp. 249f.

- (ix)
 (viii) The identity of Jesus from his deeds,
Mtt. xi 2ff. xii.

The 'Q' passage xi2ff. (cf. Lk. vii. 18ff.) is used by Matthew to raise the question of the identity of Jesus from his works, and to do so with reference to the person of John the Baptist. Jesus' miracles are referred to by the evangelist as the 'works of the Messiah' (v.2). The answer to the Baptist's question whether Jesus is the Messiah is in terms of an account of the miracles, with allusions to scripture (VV. 5ff.). Those not finding cause for offence in Jesus are pronounced blessed (V.6). The 'decisive Christological question'¹ has been put and answered in terms of Jesus' miracles and preaching, i.e. what has been seen and heard.

The passage goes on to discuss John the Baptist (VV.7ff.), and his relation to the kingdom of God and the Son of Man. The quotation from Mal. iii.1 at V. 10 looks as if it was an addition at Mk. i. 2 because it is cited as from Isaiah! Mtt. iii. 2 only has the Isaiah quotation. The Malachi quotation had, obviously, been used with reference to John the Baptist in Christian tradition. In VV. 12f. use is made of a problematical saying of uncertain original form which Luke has at xvi. 16. It suggests that the era of

law and the prophets was prior to John, that of the progress of the kingdom of heaven after John. In the rest of the gospel we find that John started to preach the kingdom (iii.2) and that Jesus continued that preaching (iv.17) and attested it by his deeds (xii. 28). John does not apparently himself belong to the era of the kingdom (xi.11); he was Elijah (V. 14, cf. Mk. ix 13). Jesus is again described as the Son of Man (V. 19).

The rest of the passage is concerned with the period of Jesus' earthly life and the response that his ministry, like that of John the Baptist, received. The cue for this is the 'Q' saying about 'this generation's' response to John and the Son of Man (VV. 16ff.). A 'Q' passage (VV. 21ff, cf. Lk. x. 13ff.) rebukes the cities which failed to respond to Jesus' mighty works (V.20). Judgment will be related to this failure. The closing section (VV. 25ff., cf. Lk. x. 21f.) records the combination of concealment and revelation in the task of Jesus, both being involved in his earthly life. Jesus is finally characterized in meekness and lowliness and as such summoning men with authority. The passage is united by Matthew round the theme of the nature and character of Jesus' historical messiahship, and the combination of concealment and revelation in his deeds and words, depending on men's

viewed in the same way as that of John the Baptist as Elijah, as dependent on willingness to accept it (VV. 14f).

The fact that the deeds of Jesus witness to his authority, although it was denied, is further emphasized in chapter xii. Here Matthew gathers two pericopae from Mark, which he has so far omitted, xii. 1-8 cf. Mk. ii. 23ff.) and 9-15 (cf. Mk. iii 1ff.). In the first of these Matthew has emphasized the christological importance of the pericope by inserting VV. 5-7 and omitting Mk. ii. 27. The three additional points concern the fulfilment of the law (V.5), the presence of a greater than the temple (V.6), and the transcendence of the way of sacrifice and ritual (V.7, cf. ix. 13a). V. 8 then refers to the ground for all this in the presence and authority of Jesus as the Son of Man and is not, as in Mark, merely a statement of the kerygma. This is the opposite of what he did at x. 32f. (cf. Mk. viii. 38). xii. 9ff. demonstrate the authority of Jesus and the guilt of the Jewish leaders (V. 14). VV. 11f. use the Jewish argument 'a minori ad maius' (cf. Lk. xiv. 5). The authority of the Son of Man rests on his fulfilment of all righteousness, and demonstrates the scriptural principle of V.7.

The following verses reveal that the point of the section is the historical fate of Jesus, the concealed Son of Man and Servant of the Lord, who showed his

authority to those who would accept it, but who was rejected by the Jewish leaders (xii. 14, 15ff., 22ff.,)⁵. In v-vii, viii-x Matthew demonstrated Jesus' authority in word and deed and from xi 2 had begun to reveal its nature and the issues involved in accepting it. The key text here is Is. xlii. 1-4 (see Mtt. xii. 18-21). The terms of reference are the facts of Jesus' life; the subject is the historical Jesus. Matthew has skilfully rewritten Mark to establish his point. This can be seen from his rewriting of Mk. iii. 7a, 10a, 12 (Mk. iii. 7b, 8 are found at Mtt. iv 25) with reference to Mk. iii. 6 - which has been transposed to this point together with Mk. ii. 23ff., iii 1ff. Jesus, knowing the plot of the Pharisees, retreats and forbids those he heals to make him known. This is a historicization of the secrecy-theme, which in Mark is here concerned with the cries of demons (see Mk. iii. 12). But it is used to support Matthew's presentation of the historical Jesus as the concealed Messiah who is revealed only to faith. The Marcan secrecy-theme was scarcely understandable in historical terms at all, indeed it was impossible, because it was set against history as such; it implied that historically and within history Jesus could not be known as the Messiah, and still cannot be known as Messiah, apart from faith, until the parousia when all

shall see him (see Mk. viii. 38, xiii. 26, xiv. 62). In Mark (see iii.12), V. 16 refers to the demons and the fact that their knowledge of Jesus' identity was not allowed to be made known historically, during his lifetime, or merely from the events of history. The demons, like the Bath'god at the Baptism and transfiguration are extra - historical, though they refer to Jesus. Within history Jesus' identity is only made known to faith in, from, and after the resurrection, in the preaching of the Gospel after the resurrection from the disciples' post-resurrection faith. Matthew insists that Jesus' identity was in evidence in his lifetime, though denied and rejected and that it was part of the nature of Jesus' messiahship that this should have been the case (Mtt. xii. 17ff.). Matthew develops from Mark a christological interpretation of Jesus' life, linked with an eschatological understanding of history. The tensions in the Marcan narrative between concealment and revelation are seen as part of the tensions in history itself, understood in these eschatological-christological terms. Jesus' life is viewed by Matthew as a special period in history revealing the significance and goal of all history, whereas Mark separated it from the time of the Gospel and set all history over against the Gospel, with the parousia

as the time of complete revelation at the end of history and the resurrection the point of partial revelation carried forward by the Gospel within history. For ~~the~~ Matthew the time after Jesus' life is the time of the church when the disciples continue the task of preaching the Gospel which Jesus began and made possible, a Gospel concerned with the coming of the kingdom of heaven, guaranteed through history by the person of Jesus and his presence in history. The concealment of his messiahship is then seen as a factor within history, understood as the unfolding of God's purposes towards their ultimate fulfilment, in which the presence of the Messiah and Son of Man is an element and an important stage. Full revelation of the kingdom and of the Messiah/Son of Man can, of course, only come later, but Matthew sets Jesus' life within a wider sweep of history, understood eschatologically, culminating in the events of apocalyptic. This is a development from Mark's narrative, but a rationalization of it in historical-eschatological terms from an understanding of the significance of Jesus' person. This means that Matthew fails to take seriously the fact that understanding of the significance of Jesus' person was post-resurrection (see Mtt. xvi. 16ff.) and that Jesus' life was the prelude to the Gospel, the presupposition of

Jesus' role as Son of Man, and not part of it (see Matthew's development of 'Q' Son of Man sayings and of Mk. ii 10, 28 along the same lines, and his alteration of the saying at Mtt. x. 32f.).

Mtt. xii. 17ff. points to the presence in history of the Messiah as the Servant of the Lord who did not insist on his identity but who carried forward the purposes of God for the nations. His concealment was part of the plan of history and was expressed in his rejection by the Jewish leaders. For the moment, however, the confrontation is avoided, though inevitable. That the confrontation is a direct and historical one, though its nature is not explicit, is made plain in xii. 22ff. - the Marcan - 'Q' pericope of the accusation that Jesus was in league with Beelzeboul. This expresses for ~~the~~ Matthew the nature of the historical confrontation between Jesus and his opponents, in terms of Jesus' identity and authority in history as the Son of Man (xii. 32) derived from the holy Spirit and made known in his works.

The issue of decision with regard to Jesus and his works in history is made plain in xii. 22ff. V. 22 represents the 'Q' introduction, the healing of a deaf and dumb man (cf. Lk. xi. 14 and Mtt. ix. 32f.). Matthew then poses the

question of the crowds about, Jesus being the son of David and the Pharisees' objection that he is in league with the prince of the demons (VV. 23f.). Although Matthew has omitted the silencing of the demons he does not consider that they bore direct witness to his identity. Mtt. viii. 29 is not heard, as in Mark, because Jesus was alone (see viii. 28, cf. Mk. v. 2). But the exorcisms of Jesus are regarded by Matthew as raising the question of his identity directly. He has used the 'Q' version to stress the idea of the presence of the kingdom through Jesus' deeds (V. 28) and of the Son of Man in his person (V. 32). ⁶ ~~cf. for~~
~~Matthew's use and development of 'Q' here.~~ But the cue for introducing the latter saying here is taken from the Marcan version of this debate (see V. 31, cf. Mk. iii. 28f.) since the saying is not part of the 'Q' version (see Lk. xii. 10). In Luke the saying follows one which differentiates between the earthly Jesus and the Son of Man (xii. 9f. contrast Mtt x. 32f.) and seems to give the reason why one's attitude to Jesus now brings a corresponding one in return from the Son of Man at the judgment, because it amounts to blasphemy against the holy Spirit. Blasphemy against the Son of Man himself is not counted. The Marcan version (iii. 28f.), which does not mention the Son of Man,

stresses blasphemy against the Spirit, as the Source of Jesus' authority. In 'Q' the saying probably differentiated between the historical Jesus and the holy Spirit which is at work in the kerygma. The 'Q' Son of Man sayings present Jesus directly as the Son of Man, but recognize the ambiguity of his authority and identity, in that historically it was disputed.⁷ All the 'Q' Son of Man sayings refer to the historical Jesus as the authoritative Son of Man from the context of the kerygma and bear witness to the fact that historically that authority was disputed. The basis of it is the holy Spirit, as he is also the basis of the authority of the kerygma. It is that authority which it is an unforgiveable offence to blaspheme. The Marcan version of the saying refers simply to blasphemy against the holy Spirit as the Source of Jesus' authority and stresses the importance of the issue of decision with regard to Jesus. The decision is there seen as made with regard to Jesus from the context of the preaching of the Gospel, with the Spirit as the link uniting that Gospel and the historical Jesus. The use of both the 'Q' version and the Marcan version in Matthew stresses the historical issue of decision with regard to Jesus as one made with reference to the holy Spirit as the source of the earthly authority of the Son of Man, illustrating this with reference

basis of the power which has been displayed is not evident to the world at large (cf. viii. 27). The historical difficulties of Jesus' uttering^{an} apparently open statement of his identity were not considered by Matthew, whose concern was not with historical situations in themselves. He was concerned with the presence of the Son of Man within history in Jesus of Nazareth, as part of his concern with the presence of the kingdom of heaven behind the events of history. Mark could not have conceived of the presence of the Son of Man within history, even though he did conceive of the passion of Jesus as the prior way by which the Son of Man had to go, but that was a christological understanding. For Matthew the miracle here recorded was a demonstration of the presence and power of the Son of Man, by which it was bestowed on men. He recognizes at the same time that this was denied. This authority is the basis for Jesus' being in the company of tax-collectors and sinners (VV. 12f. cf. xi. 19) which is also justified from scripture¹⁷. The more unified form of ix. 14ff. in Matthew stresses the presence of the bridegroom, and re-emphasizes the original eschatological significance of the saying in V. 15. in terms of the presence of Jesus.

In ix. 18ff. Matthew picks up another part of Mark on which he has already drawn and constructs a group of

three miracle-stories which has its emphasis on faith (ix. 22, 28f.). It is true that Matthew has omitted Mk. v. 36, but he has heightened the evidence of faith in the ruler at ix. 18¹⁸. Matthew omits the command to silence at Mk. v. 43 in preference for stress on the spreading of Jesus' fame. But the command in Mark could scarcely be understood historically and such commands were frequently followed by the reverse situation, practically as a dogmatic pattern (cf. Mk. vii. 36). Just as the Marcan commands to silence must be understood from a dogmatic point of view as reflecting actual secrecy in history over against the Gospel, so must the evidence of miracles in Matthew be set against the fact that the world at large appears as quite ignorant of Jesus' identity. The demands for faith, christologically understood, are what count.

The latter point is the main emphasis of Mtt. ix. 27-31, the last of this group. Comparison with Mtt, xx. 29-34 and Mk. x. 46ff. shows that it is a further use by Matthew of that Marcan pericope. Again there are two blind men and they use the title son of David, which is for Matthew a factual statement (see i. 1, 17, 20). The reference to faith is also dependent on Mark, though it is in a distinctively Matthaeian form, (cf. viii. 13), as is the introduction to the pericope¹⁹. There is no support for Lohmeyer's theory

that it belongs to a Galilean tradition about the concealed Son of Man.²⁰ The pericope is yet more compressed here than at xx. 29ff., except from the Matthaean mention of touching the blind men (ix. 29, xx. 34) and the stress on faith, omitted at xx. 29ff., which is the main emphasis here.²¹ The crowd's attempt to silence the men is omitted here (cf. Mk. x. 48, Mtt. xx. 31), but, at the end, the men are sent away with a strict charge to secrecy (V. 30) reminiscent of Mk. i. 43f. It is followed, as at Mk. i. 45, by disobedience (V. 31). Apart from faith the miracles are meaningless, and impossible (cf. Mtt. xiii. 58,)²². The reactions of bystanders in Matthew illustrate this point too (see viii. 27, 33f., ix. 8, 26, 33f.). VV. 32ff. bring the accounts of miracles to a close and show their christological significance.²³

VV. 32ff. are borrowed from the 'Q' introduction to the Bezebooul controversy (see Lk. xi. 14f., Mtt. xii. 22ff.). This and the previous pericope may also compensate for the omission of Mk. vii. 31ff., viii. 22ff. The inclusion of this passage here can only be in order to indicate the christological implications of the miracles. The authority of Jesus is what is in question, on the basis of quite unique events in the history of Israel (v. 33b)²⁴. V. 34 shows, however, the Messiah's hiddenness in Israel²⁵.

The signs are not necessarily perceived. The demands of faith have been stressed throughout this section in two ways, one with reference to the theme of 'following' Jesus, i.e. of discipleship (viii. 18ff., 23ff., ix. 9, 27), the other with regard to the authority of Jesus in healing (viii. 10, 13, ix. 2, 18, 22, 28f.). In each case the hidden 'authority' of Jesus as Son of Man (viii. 20, ix. 6) has been demonstrated, an authority exercised 'before the time' (viii. 29).

References for Chapter Three

Section (vii)

- ¹cf., for that view, Wrede Das Messiasgeheimnis p. 11.
- ²cf. Held op. cit. pp. 256f.
- ³op. cit. p. 257.
- ⁴cf. Held op. cit. p. 255.
- ⁵cf. Schniewind op. cit. pp. 37, 106.
- ⁶cf. Tödt Der Menschensohn pp. 112ff., as against Dibelius Jesus 1946 pp. 86ff.
- ⁷Bornkamm op. cit. pp. 52ff., Held op. cit. pp. 200ff.,.
- ⁸op. cit. p. 163.
- ⁹Held op. cit. p. 204.
- ¹⁰op. cit. p. 115.
- ¹¹Held op. cit. pp. 172ff.
- ¹²op. cit. p. 166.

¹³Der Menschensohn 'Z.N.W.' 50, pp. 185ff.

¹⁴cf. Aland Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum pp. 61, 125.

¹⁵see Held op. cit. pp. 175ff.

¹⁶op. cit. p. 169, cf. Schniewind op. cit. p. 118.

¹⁷see Held op. cit. p. 248.

¹⁸Held op. cit. p. 180, referring to Klostermann Das Matthäusevangelium Tübingen 1927 pp. 82ff. and Bacon Studies in Matthew. New York 1930. p. 193.

¹⁹Held op. cit. pp. 219f.

²⁰op. cit. pp. 178ff.

²¹cf. Held op. cit. pp. 223ff.

²²Held op. cit. pp. 276ff.

²³cf. Held op. cit. pp. 256ff.

²⁴cf Lohmeyer op. cit. p. 181.

²⁵cf. Schniewind op. cit. p. 124.

(vii) The mission of the disciples, Mtt. ix 35-xi 1.

Matthew's account of the call and sending out of the disciples is a collection comprising or representing Mk. iii. 13-19, vi. 7-11 and 'Q' material¹. They receive authority over unclean spirits (x. 1, cf. Mk. vi. 7) and will suffer the same fate as Jesus himself (x. 24f., 38). They are his representatives (x.40), and must continue his work and preaching (ix. 35ff., x.7, cf. iv. 17), the Gospel of the kingdom which he guarantees. They share too his homelessness in the world (x. 9ff.) in this period of transition (x.22b) before the coming of the Son of Man (x.23). The mission of the disciples is here given its point of termination, just as the coming of Jesus was its starting-point. Matthew makes no differentiation between Jesus then and in the future (x.32f).

References for Chapter Three

Section (vii)

¹Held op. cit. pp. 249f.

- (ix)
 (viii) The identity of Jesus from his deeds,
Mtt. xi 2ff. xii.

The 'Q' passage xi2ff. (cf. Lk. vii. 18ff.) is used by Matthew to raise the question of the identity of Jesus from his works, and to do so with reference to the person of John the Baptist. Jesus' miracles are referred to by the evangelist as the 'works of the Messiah' (v.2). The answer to the Baptist's question whether Jesus is the Messiah is in terms of an account of the miracles, with allusions to scripture (VV. 5ff.). Those not finding cause for offence in Jesus are pronounced blessed (V.6). The 'decisive Christological question'¹ has been put and answered in terms of Jesus' miracles and preaching, i.e. what has been seen and heard.

The passage goes on to discuss John the Baptist (VV.7ff.), and his relation to the kingdom of God and the Son of Man. The quotation from Mal. iii.1 at V. 10 looks as if it was an addition at Mk. i. 2 because it is cited as from Isaiah! Mtt. iii. 2 only has the Isaiah quotation. The Malachi quotation had, obviously, been used with reference to John the Baptist in Christian tradition. In VV. 12f. use is made of a problematical saying of uncertain original form which Luke has at xvi. 16. It suggests that the era of

law and the prophets was prior to John, that of the progress of the kingdom of heaven after John. In the rest of the gospel we find that John started to preach the kingdom (iii.2) and that Jesus continued that preaching (iv.17) and attested it by his deeds (xii. 28). John does not apparently himself belong to the era of the kingdom (xi.11); he was Elijah (V. 14, cf. Mk. ix 13). Jesus is again described as the Son of Man (V. 19).

The rest of the passage is concerned with the period of Jesus' earthly life and the response that his ministry, like that of John the Baptist, received. The cue for this is the 'Q' saying about 'this generation's' response to John and the Son of Man (VV. 16ff.). A 'Q' passage (VV. 21ff, cf. Lk. x. 13ff.) rebukes the cities which failed to respond to Jesus' mighty works (V.20). Judgment will be related to this failure. The closing section (VV. 25ff., cf. Lk. x. 21f.) records the combination of concealment and revelation in the task of Jesus, both being involved in his earthly life. Jesus is finally characterized in meekness and lowliness and as such summoning men with authority. The passage is united by Matthew round the theme of the nature and character of Jesus' historical messiahship, and the combination of concealment and revelation in his deeds and words, depending on men's

viewed in the same way as that of John the Baptist as Elijah, as dependent on willingness to accept it (VV. 14f).

The fact that the deeds of Jesus witness to his authority, although it was denied, is further emphasized in chapter xii. Here Matthew gathers two pericopae from Mark, which he has so far omitted, xii. 1-8 cf. Mk. ii. 23ff.) and 9-15 (cf. Mk. iii 1ff.). In the first of these Matthew has emphasized the christological importance of the pericope by inserting VV. 5-7 and omitting Mk. ii. 27. The three additional points concern the fulfilment of the law (V.5), the presence of a greater than the temple (V.6), and the transcendence of the way of sacrifice and ritual (V.7, cf. ix. 13a). V. 8 then refers to the ground for all this in the presence and authority of Jesus as the Son of Man and is not, as in Mark, merely a statement of the kerygma. This is the opposite of what he did at x. 32f. (cf. Mk. viii. 38). xii. 9ff. demonstrate the authority of Jesus and the guilt of the Jewish leaders (V. 14). VV. 11f. use the Jewish argument 'a minori ad maius' (cf. Lk. xiv. 5). The authority of the Son of Man rests on his fulfilment of all righteousness, and demonstrates the scriptural principle of V.7.

The following verses reveal that the point of the section is the historical fate of Jesus, the concealed Son of Man and Servant of the Lord, who showed his

authority to those who would accept it, but who was rejected by the Jewish leaders (xii. 14, 15ff., 22ff.,)⁵. In v-vii, viii-x Matthew demonstrated Jesus' authority in word and deed and from xi 2 had begun to reveal its nature and the issues involved in accepting it. The key text here is Is. xlii. 1-4 (see Mtt. xii. 18-21). The terms of reference are the facts of Jesus' life; the subject is the historical Jesus. Matthew has skilfully rewritten Mark to establish his point. This can be seen from his rewriting of Mk. iii. 7a, 10a, 12 (Mk. iii. 7b, 8 are found at Mtt. iv 25) with reference to Mk. iii. 6 - which has been transposed to this point together with Mk. ii. 23ff., iii 1ff. Jesus, knowing the plot of the Pharisees, retreats and forbids those he heals to make him known. This is a historicization of the secrecy-theme, which in Mark is here concerned with the cries of demons (see Mk. iii. 12). But it is used to support Matthew's presentation of the historical Jesus as the concealed Messiah who is revealed only to faith. The Marcan secrecy-theme was scarcely understandable in historical terms at all, indeed it was impossible, because it was set against history as such; it implied that historically and within history Jesus could not be known as the Messiah, and still cannot be known as Messiah, apart from faith, until the parousia when all

shall see him (see Mk. viii. 38, xiii. 26, xiv. 62). In Mark (see iii.12), V. 16 refers to the demons and the fact that their knowledge of Jesus' identity was not allowed to be made known historically, during his lifetime, or merely from the events of history. The demons, like the Bath'god at the Baptism and transfiguration are extra - historical, though they refer to Jesus. Within history Jesus' identity is only made known to faith in, from, and after the resurrection, in the preaching of the Gospel after the resurrection from the disciples' post-resurrection faith. Matthew insists that Jesus' identity was in evidence in his lifetime, though denied and rejected and that it was part of the nature of Jesus' messiahship that this should have been the case (Mtt. xii. 17ff.). Matthew develops from Mark a christological interpretation of Jesus' life, linked with an eschatological understanding of history. The tensions in the Marcan narrative between concealment and revelation are seen as part of the tensions in history itself, understood in these eschatological-christological terms. Jesus' life is viewed by Matthew as a special period in history revealing the significance and goal of all history, whereas Mark separated it from the time of the Gospel and set all history over against the Gospel, with the parousia

as the time of complete revelation at the end of history and the resurrection the point of partial revelation carried forward by the Gospel within history. For ~~the~~ Matthew the time after Jesus' life is the time of the church when the disciples continue the task of preaching the Gospel which Jesus began and made possible, a Gospel concerned with the coming of the kingdom of heaven, guaranteed through history by the person of Jesus and his presence in history. The concealment of his messiahship is then seen as a factor within history, understood as the unfolding of God's purposes towards their ultimate fulfilment, in which the presence of the Messiah and Son of Man is an element and an important stage. Full revelation of the kingdom and of the Messiah/Son of Man can, of course, only come later, but Matthew sets Jesus' life within a wider sweep of history, understood eschatologically, culminating in the events of apocalyptic. This is a development from Mark's narrative, but a rationalization of it in historical-eschatological terms from an understanding of the significance of Jesus' person. This means that Matthew fails to take seriously the fact that understanding of the significance of Jesus' person was post-resurrection (see Mtt. xvi. 16ff.) and that Jesus' life was the prelude to the Gospel, the presupposition of

Jesus' role as Son of Man, and not part of it (see Matthew's development of 'Q' Son of Man sayings and of Mk. ii 10, 28 along the same lines, and his alteration of the saying at Mtt. x. 32f.).

Mtt. xii. 17ff. points to the presence in history of the Messiah as the Servant of the Lord who did not insist on his identity but who carried forward the purposes of God for the nations. His concealment was part of the plan of history and was expressed in his rejection by the Jewish leaders. For the moment, however, the confrontation is avoided, though inevitable. That the confrontation is a direct and historical one, though its nature is not explicit, is made plain in xii. 22ff. - the Marcan - 'Q' pericope of the accusation that Jesus was in league with Beelzeboul. This expresses for ~~the~~ Matthew the nature of the historical confrontation between Jesus and his opponents, in terms of Jesus' identity and authority in history as the Son of Man (xii. 32) derived from the holy Spirit and made known in his works.

The issue of decision with regard to Jesus and his works in history is made plain in xii. 22ff. V. 22 represents the 'Q' introduction, the healing of a deaf and dumb man (cf. Lk. xi. 14 and Mtt. ix. 32f.). Matthew then poses the

question of the crowds about, Jesus being the son of David and the Pharisees' objection that he is in league with the prince of the demons (VV. 23f.). Although Matthew has omitted the silencing of the demons he does not consider that they bore direct witness to his identity. Mtt. viii. 29 is not heard, as in Mark, because Jesus was alone (see viii. 28, cf. Mk. v. 2). But the exorcisms of Jesus are regarded by Matthew as raising the question of his identity directly. He has used the 'Q' version to stress the idea of the presence of the kingdom through Jesus' deeds (V. 28) and of the Son of Man in his person (V. 32). ⁶ ~~cf. for~~
~~Matthew's use and development of 'Q' here.~~ But the cue for introducing the latter saying here is taken from the Marcan version of this debate (see V. 31, cf. Mk. iii. 28f.) since the saying is not part of the 'Q' version (see Lk. xii. 10). In Luke the saying follows one which differentiates between the earthly Jesus and the Son of Man (xii. 9f. contrast Mtt x. 32f.) and seems to give the reason why one's attitude to Jesus now brings a corresponding one in return from the Son of Man at the judgment, because it amounts to blasphemy against the holy Spirit. Blasphemy against the Son of Man himself is not counted. The Marcan version (iii. 28f.), which does not mention the Son of Man,

stresses blasphemy against the Spirit, as the Source of Jesus' authority. In 'Q' the saying probably differentiated between the historical Jesus and the holy Spirit which is at work in the kerygma. The 'Q' Son of Man sayings present Jesus directly as the Son of Man, but recognize the ambiguity of his authority and identity, in that historically it was disputed.⁷ All the 'Q' Son of Man sayings refer to the historical Jesus as the authoritative Son of Man from the context of the kerygma and bear witness to the fact that historically that authority was disputed. The basis of it is the holy Spirit, as he is also the basis of the authority of the kerygma. It is that authority which it is an unforgiveable offence to blaspheme. The Marcan version of the saying refers simply to blasphemy against the holy Spirit as the Source of Jesus' authority and stresses the importance of the issue of decision with regard to Jesus. The decision is there seen as made with regard to Jesus from the context of the preaching of the Gospel, with the Spirit as the link uniting that Gospel and the historical Jesus. The use of both the 'Q' version and the Marcan version in Matthew stresses the historical issue of decision with regard to Jesus as one made with reference to the holy Spirit as the source of the earthly authority of the Son of Man, illustrating this with reference

to the accusation that Jesus was in league with the evil spirits. This is a development of both Mark and 'Q'. It is Matthew who here directly identifies the earthly, historical Jesus with the Son of Man, though recognizing that historically this identity was concealed. For Matthew this does not absolve men from guilt in deciding to reject his authority, however, because in doing so they blasphemed the holy Spirit. The saying is in this way taken out of its kerygmatic context and placed in relation to history. This historicizes the presentation of Mark, who was interested in one's attitude to the historical Jesus through the Gospel by which the Spirit witnessed to his identity. For Matthew Jesus' exorcisms represented the work of the kingdom of God within history (V. 28) because of the presence of the Son of Man working in the power of the holy Spirit. He it is who will presumably institute the judgement on the basis of one's present words (VV. 33ff.).

The 'Q' version of the request for a sign brings this section to a climax (Mtt. xii. 38ff., cf. Lk. xi. 29ff.). The only sign to be given to 'this generation' is the resurrection of the Son of Man (V. 40, so Matthew interprets 'Q', cf. Lk. xi. 30). This sign will establish their guilt, which consisted in a failure to recognize a greater than Jonah and Solomon (VV. 41f.). The 'Q' passage about the return of the evil spirit (VV. 43ff., cf. Lk. xi. 24ff.)

is applied to 'this generation' (V. 45b) because it had been exorcized by the presence of Jesus only to be possessed by more and worse spirits than before. Matthew concludes (VV. 46ff.) with the Marcan passage about the insignificance of earthly ties in relation to Jesus beside those of the ones who do the will of his Father in heaven (i. e. his disciples).

References for Chapter Three
Section (viii)

¹Held op. cit. p. 251.

²Schrenk in TWNT I pp. 608ff. on $\beta\lambda\lambda\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$, and cf. the different use of that verb at Lk. vii. 16b.

³cf. Schniewind op. cit. p. 151.

⁴see Tödt op. cit. p. 109.

⁵cf. Schniewind op. cit. p. 155.

⁶Tödt op. cit. pp. 237ff., *for Matthew's use of and development of Q.*

⁷cf. Bornkamm in Bornkamm - Barth-Held op. cit. p. 34.

X
 (ix) The identity of Jesus from his preaching, - Mtt.

xiii 1-52.

Matthew uses and develops the Marcan parable-chapter to illustrate further his understanding of the historical basis of the Gospel in Jesus' words and deeds, both in respect of eschatology and christology, though historically it was denied. Within the compass of Jesus' earthly life Matthew combined revelation and concealment, the presence of the eschatological history as part of a process on the way to fulfilment in a judgment based on present decision with regard to Jesus, i.e. to his words and deeds which witness to that process, on the basis of his identity with the coming Son of Man. Mark's presentation of the relation between concealment and revelation (see Mk. iv. 21ff.) has been omitted (the sayings appear, with different meanings, elsewhere), and material added which stresses their presence together in history, in the response of different groups of people. Concealment and revelation are shown to depend on prior response to and understanding of (VV. 10ff.) the word of the kingdom (V.19). In the parables Matthew has emphasized the idea of growth. Thus Mk. iv. 26ff. has been omitted, or replaced by Mtt. xiii. 24ff., and V. 33 (cf. Lk. xiii. 20f.) has been added as the 'Q' companion of VV. 31ff. (= Mk. iv.

30ff.)). VV. 44ff. stress the need for effort and VV. 47ff. the mixture which will be sorted out at the judgment.

Matthew has rationalized and historicized the Marcan account in VV. 10ff. In Mark there is a play on the word παραβολή between Mk. iv. 10 and 11, reflecting the combination of independent material and Mark's use of the tradition's depiction of Jesus' method of teaching in parables and expounding them in more detail to his disciples, to demonstrate the fact that Jesus' parables have an inner meaning, not historically discernable, in their witness to Jesus' identity. Thus, for those without, i.e. outside a faith-relationship to Jesus like his disciples, everything is a riddle. In Matthew, 'parables' have been virtually equated with 'riddles' requiring greater exposition. Their purpose was to confirm the blindness of the unbelievers. Matthew has created a unity out of Mark in that the disciples now ask the reason for Jesus' method of teaching (V.10) and the following verses explain it. Matthew expands the passage to emphasize the distinction between the disciples and the rest, a distinction on the basis of prior willingness to accept what Jesus had to say (see the addition of V. 12, cf. Mk. iv. 25). The peculiar blessedness of the disciples in seeing and hearing is stressed by the addition of VV. 16f. (cf. Lk. x. 23f.). It is a privilege of time as well as

election. This is then illustrated by the exposition of the parable of the sower (VV. 18ff., cf. Mk. iv. 14ff. and contrast Mk. V. 13.), which itself is shown to teach the same as VV. 10ff. The interpretation is itself rewritten to emphasize the responsibility of those hearing, in order to fit it more closely with the present context and to rationalize the details of the exposition which still reveal confusion between the identity of the seed and the kinds of earth. VV. 34f. also represent a unification of Mark in accordance with Matthew's systematization of this passage and sum up the description of Jesus' teaching which it contains. A further quotation (from Ps. 1xxviii.2) refers to the secret enunciation of revelation, of things concealed from of old.

VV. 36ff. then provide an exposition of the parable of the tares. Here the nature of the revelation contained in the parables is clear. A completely allegorical explanation is given which equates the sower of the word of the kingdom in the world with the Son of Man, i.e. the historical Jesus (VV. 37f.). Contrary forces are at work and result in the presence of opponents of the sons of the kingdom. At the end of the world the Son of Man returns to judge and separate mankind according to their pedigree. Within history or the world (V.38, there is a process, dependent

on the activity of Jesus, which will come to fruition at the last day. Hidden within this process there is the kingdom of heaven (VV. 44ff.) to be sought after (cf. Mtt. xi. 12), which will grow like mustard-seed or leaven (VV. 31ff.), but it cannot accommodate everyone (VV. 47ff.) All this is part of the learning of the scribe 'instructed in the kingdom of heaven' (V.52). The disciples understand and gain enlightenment from the exposition of the parables.

Matthew provides us in this section with his understanding of history in terms of eschatology and christology on the basis on the earthly activity of Jesus, the Son of Man. All this is concealed from some, but revealed to others. The Son of Man has sown the good seed of the word of the kingdom in the world, and the kingdom itself is on the way towards its completion.

There is a question here about the relation between the kingdom of the Son of Man (V. 41) and the kingdom of the Father (V. 43). Ultimately there can be no differentiation, but one is within the historical process and the other is at its culmination. Elsewhere in Matthew there is no differentiation (Mtt. xvi. 28, xx. 21 - both Matthaean alterations of Mark). What belongs to the Father belongs also to the Son (xvi. 27). Also Matthew is quite clear elsewhere that the kingdom at present at

work is the same as the one which will come to completion. The differentiation here is probably due to the fact that this is pre-Matthaeian tradition¹. But it fits with the tradition at the end of Matthew (xxviii. 18) about the present Lordship of Jesus, the Son of Man, over the world. Matthew does not stress any differentiation and has used this piece of tradition to reinforce his view of the historical activity of Jesus as the Son of Man in relation to the eschatological process in history which comes to completion in apocalyptic events. This process commenced from the preaching and activity of Jesus and constitutes the presence of the kingdom of God in history and the basis on which the future judgement will be executed. Jesus' preaching has itself eschatological character, dividing men and building up the church, i.e. the righteous who will inherit the kingdom. Meanwhile history continues and does not help on the eschatological process but even hinders it (Mtt. xi. 12). But yet things happen in history which reveal the true direction of affairs, though only at the judgement will this be fully apparent (cf. viii. 11f., xxi. 43). Fundamental to this process, according to the interpretation of the parable of the tares is the earthly, historical activity of the Son of Man. The difference between the interim-period and that of the final consummation

is here expressed as one between the kingdom of the Son of Man, co-terminous with the world and history, and that of the Father. Within the interim-period there are two undifferentiated groups, although Matthew presumably means by this that they are both allowed to continue but that the existence of the church in some measure records the fact that there are two groups (cf. V. 11)² The differentiation of these two groups will depend on whether they owe their existence to Jesus or the evil one. Jesus as Son of Man is responsible for the differentiation at each end. He is Son of Man both as the earthly preacher and as the judge of the world³. The 'mysteries of the kingdom' which are revealed to the disciples (V.11) must include for Matthew this dual role of Jesus as the Son of Man. Here and at xxv. 31ff. we see the basis for Matthew's development of the conception of Jesus as the Son of Man⁴, in two roles, the earlier one concealed, the later one revealed.

References for Chapter Three

Section (ix)

¹Strecker op. cit. p. 166. n. 7.

²The idea that the kingdom of the Son of Man is itself the church (see Tödt op. cit. pp. 66ff.) is not convincing.

³Tödt op. cit. cf. p. 87. p. 126.

⁴Tödt op. cit. p. 74.

(x) The historical concealment of Jesus' identity,
revealed to his disciples, - Mtt. xiii. 53-xvi. 20.

Mtt., xiii. 53ff. is the last pericope in the second of the two Marcan sections which Matthew has rearranged - the other being Mk. ii. 1-iii. 6. It is the account of Jesus' rejection at Nazareth and it brings us back to earth and into history with an account of the concealment of Jesus and his historical rejection. Jesus' words and deeds, his wisdom and mighty works (V. 54, singled out more directly than in Mk.vi. 2b), are cause for offence not faith (V. 57). Indeed mighty works themselves are represented by Matthew as dependent on faith (V.58, contrast Mk. vi. 5f.). Mighty works do not lead to faith for the observer but depend on the faith, of the recipient. This is the faith of the leper, of the centurion, of the bearers of the paralytic, of Jairus, of the woman with the haemorrhage, and of the two blind men, and which the disciples are frequently shown to have only in little measure (see vii. 26). It is faith specifically in Jesus (see Mtt. ix. 18). It does not bring the miracle about but it enables Jesus to act. It is the basis on which understanding of Jesus' identity can grow and it is essential as the fruit of that understanding. But Matthew differentiates faith and understanding, whilst

establishing a relationship between them. There can be faith without understanding, but understanding without faith is of little use. Thus Matthew represents the disciples as gaining in understanding and having to gain in faith too, during Jesus' lifetime.

Here too Matthew systematizes Mark, but he thereby alters Mark's meaning. For Mark, Jesus' lifetime was not without faith, but it was without understanding. There could be no historical understanding of Jesus' identity since it depended on faith in his person, informed by the post-resurrection Gospel. But there could be faith in the historical Jesus, as shown by the miracles of faith in Mk. iv. 35-v. 43. Mk. vi. 1ff. illustrates for Mark the necessity of faith, which could not be replaced by historical understanding, and which could not be based on historical knowledge of Jesus. Matthew has historicized this picture of the relationship between faith and understanding in order to insist that Jesus was the Messiah and his works were the works of the Messiah (xi. 2). The disciples were gaining in understanding of this during Jesus' lifetime, since the Gospel was not the creation of the resurrection alone but depended on Jesus' life and ministry as well. But their faith did not come to fruition at the time. Both faith and understanding were completed

at the resurrection, as far as they can be before the parousia. Matthew also insists that the miracles, as the answers to faith, are witnesses to Jesus' identity and are perceived as such by faith. But he recognizes, and enforces, the fact that without faith there can be no miracle and miracles are not witnesses to Jesus' identity apart from faith. It depends, both then and now, on reception of the signs, and words, present in Jesus' life. Matthew's alterations of Mark imply a different stress but not a contradictory sense or understanding of the historical basis of the Gospel. For Mark too the Gospel is based on Jesus' historicity (Mk. i. 1). But Matthew does not differentiate in the same way as Mark between the life of Jesus and after. For Mark the differentiation stresses the difference between history and the Gospel and the relation between them. Matthew differentiates rather between the historical life of Jesus and the parousia, with the interim time of the church conditioned by both. He stresses the relation between history and the Gospel evident to faith, though to faith alone. Thus Herod does not perceive, from an account of Jesus' mighty works, who Jesus is (Mtt. xiv. 1f)- though an earlier Herod had sought to kill the son of David (ii). The revelation was there, though concealed. Even John the Baptist received only the indirect revelation of Jesus' deeds,

but he is less than the least in the kingdom of heaven. Only the disciples receive direct revelation.

Matthew continues with Mark's account of the feeding of the five thousand (Mtt. xiv. 15ff), knowledge of Herod's treatment of John being made the ground for Jesus' retreat into a desert place (xiv. 12f.), cf. Mtt. xii. 14ff. That Matthew has altered Mark rather than drawn more faithfully on a Galilean Son of Man tradition¹ can be shown by looking at the nature and purpose of the differences between Matthew and Mark. In V. 16 Matthew has omitted the disciples' lack of understanding of Jesus' command to them to feed the crowd themselves (cf. Mk. vi. 37f.,)². Instead they are represented as weak in faith, though they obey Jesus. Throughout, Matthew reinterprets the disciples' lack of understanding in terms of their 'little faith' and doubt, but they are represented as willing to learn³. Matthew stresses the disciples' role as mediators of the feeding miracle (VV. 18f.).

In xiv. 22ff. Matthew develops the theme of discipleship within the context of a miracle in terms of the importance of faith in Jesus for perception of Jesus' identity. The significance of this pericope in Mark (Mk. vi. 45ff.) has been changed by Matthew. In Mark, it illustrates and confirms the disciples' failure to perceive and understand

the significance of Jesus from the feeding miracle (see Mk. vi. 52), and prepares the ground for Mk. viii. 11ff.⁴. For Mark, the story illustrates the enigma of the historical Jesus for faith. In Matthew, it is a parable of discipleship and of the disciples' faith in Jesus, based on understanding of his identity. Jesus, his teaching and works, are an enigma to the crowd and the Jewish religious leaders, but not to the disciples. They are weak in faith and doubting, but are upheld by Jesus, who restores their faith and confidence, and answers their prayer for help. Jesus discloses his identity as the helper and supporter of the disciple. This is the point of the Matthaean addition, VV. 28ff. This is shown to be an addition in that it separates two consecutive verses in Mark and contains typical Matthaean words and expressions⁵. In place of Mk. vi. 52, the disciples' lack of understanding, Matthew has a christological confession of faith (xiv. 33). Lohmeyer's description⁶ of the pericope, as the revelation to the disciples of the concealed Son of Man, is right for Matthew's understanding of it.

Matthew follows Mark in depicting Jesus' healing-miracles in answer to faith (xiv. 34ff.). The miracles, like the parables, are depicted as 'riddles' to unbelief. But the person of the miracle-worker is recognized (V. 35a).

xv. 1ff. follows Mark in describing teaching of Jesus which shows him as fulfilling the law (VV. 3-6, 7-9 reversed from the Marcan in order to stress the question of priorities). Matthew shows Jesus as the true interpreter of the law rather than its destroyer (see his emphasis in V.20 on this factor, as against the emphasis of Mark, in Mk. vii 19, on the cleansing of all meats - omitted in Mtt. V.17 - according to the principle of Mtt. xxiii.23). The disciples' failure to understand is retained (VV. 16f.), but the stress is on the disciples' reception of private teaching. They are contrasted with those who are scandalized (VV. 12ff.), who are characterized as the blind leaders of the blind.

In xv. 21ff. Matthew has laid the stress on the answer to the prayer of faith (V. 28a) rather than the miracle itself (contrast Mk. vii. 29f.)⁷ Mk. vii. 24b is omitted but accounted for in VV. 22-24 in terms of Jesus' mission to Israel. The final stress is on the Gentile's faith, as at viii. 10ff. The omission of Mk. vii. 27a may be explicable from the fact that Matthew is writing for a Jewish and Mark for a Gentile audience. It is the Gentile who hails Jesus with the Jewish messianic title (V.22) in faith^{8,9} ~~on~~
~~this passage, and for the above account of it.~~²

Matthew omits Mk. vii. 31ff., and later Mk. viii. 22ff. In Mark these pericopae have symbolic value with regard to

the opening of the eyes and ears of the disciples to Jesus' identity. But they are also, as miracle-stories, filled with magical elements and not suitable for alteration in terms of the themes of faith and discipleship. They did not suit Matthew's purposes¹⁰. Instead Matthew has substituted a general account of healings in near-scriptural terms (V. 31) as at xi. 5, and presented Jesus as the great healer of the God of Israel.

The second feeding miracle is recorded by Matthew as a repetition of the first (xv. 32ff., see Mk. viii. 1ff.), and he has assimilated it to the first account¹¹. The disciples accept the feeding as their task (V. 33, cf. Mk. viii. 4), and mediate the food (V.36). As on the earlier occasion, the numbers are carefully recorded (V.38).

xvi. 1ff. shows the way Matthew has altered Mark and the sense he has given to this section. The interpolated verses 2f. give the Matthaean understanding of the request for a sign as an indication of a failure to perceive the 'signs of the times', - cf. Mtt. xii. 38ff. and xii. 28 in that setting. xvi. 4 refers back to xii. 38ff. in that it points to the sign given to 'this generation' as one of condemnation, the sign of Jonah being that of the ignored presence of the Son of Man in that generation. This contrasts with the absolute refusal in Mark of any 'sign'. The Pharisees are

represented as those without faith or understanding. In contrast, in VV. 5ff., the disciples are represented as gaining understanding but having 'little faith'.

In VV. 5ff. Matthew has historicized and rationalized the incident of the disciples in the boat without any bread (V.5) and made Jesus' statement in V.6 part of the narrative. The disciples misunderstand the saying as a rebuke for having forgotten bread (V.7) and Jesus counters this directly as evidence of 'little faith' (ὀλιγόπιστοι, V. 8, a favourite Matthaean word for the disciples), reminding them of the feeding miracles. Matthew omits the quotation of Mk. viii. {17b} 18 against the disciples, which would place them on the same level as 'those without' in Mk. iv. 11f., because he does not stress the disciples' lack of understanding (contrast Mtt. xvi. 12). Mark's concern is with the perception of the significance of Jesus' person. Because this is not a problem for Matthew as far as the disciples are concerned, he stresses the disciples' little faith instead - (which is a non-intellectual fault), and the fact that there is a sign which is not perceived. Matthew is not concerned to indicate the christological significance of the feeding miracles which is not perceived, but to deal with the disciples' little faith in being worried by the lack of bread.

He is then concerned to clear up the misunderstanding about the meaning of the saying about leaven (V.12) by making it a reference to the Pharisees' mistaken teaching. Mark had only used the saying as a link between the question of signs and the meaning of the feeding miracles, and to stress the disciples' lack of understanding. Matthew has the disciples' misunderstanding, which is dispelled by pointing out that the saying was no reference to bread at all and that the disciples' sensitivity on the point was a sign of little faith. A kind of historical unity is created, but the theological unity of the Marcan construction is lost in that the question of signs is separated from that of the feeding miracles. The passage now serves Matthew's purpose of stressing the presence of unperceived signs in the life of Jesus and the special revelation vouchsafed to the disciples.

For Matthew, the miracles were signs, which had to be perceived and understood, and which required faith for their performance and the perception of their meaning. But, for Mark, faith was a concept of importance for the whole question of perceiving the significance of the historical Jesus, when understanding was not possible simply on the grounds of historical evidence or signs. The importance of this was illustrated from the miracle-stories. Thus there could not be historical signs, nor understanding, on the basis

of history, nor faith in history. Matthew was concerned with the perception of Jesus' significance within history, which was displayed in the miracles to faith; in that way the miracles were signs. Within history there was revelation and concealment at once, in the same events. Matthew's 'historical' understanding of the unity of this passage illustrates this 'historical' understanding of the revelation in Christ in word and deed, which the disciples understood. The distinction between Matthew's and Mark's use of the concepts *συντέλεια* and *πρότις* has already been noted and is discussed further by Gerhard Barth¹².

Matthew has omitted Mk. viii. 22ff. since his scheme had no room for it and because for him it would have too objective and magical a meaning. Its symbolism in Mark has been lost. Matthew is not, as was Mark, concerned with the problem of perception of who Jesus was from history, but with the disciples' historical perception of who Jesus is, as against the lack of perception of the rest. His historical presentation of this meant that miracles had to be associated with faith.

The real confession of Jesus' messiahship by Peter in Mtt. xvi. 13ff. rounds off this section in Matthew. In Mark this passage begins a new section and does not contain

a real confession¹³. In Matthew, it opens with the rather incongruous question about whom men think the Son of Man is (V.13). It is not just that the title has been transposed from V. 21, but that Matthew takes the description of the earthly and historical Jesus as the Son of Man for granted, as is natural considering the many direct references to Jesus in those terms earlier in the gospel. The term has not been emptied of meaning and become a form of self-designation, but implies that the earthly and historical Jesus was the Son of Man then as much as in the future (see Mtt. xiii. 37). But of course the term is not sufficient as an historical description of Jesus, and could not of itself be given as the answer to the question about his identity in history. Matthew recognizes that it is a term with an esoteric meaning when applied to the historical Jesus and that in history his identity as Son of Man must be necessity have been concealed. Thus it is possible for Matthew to depict Jesus asking his disciples whom men think that he, i.e. the Son of Man, is. He presumes that a historical answer to the question is possible, and necessary, but the title Son of Man would not do as an answer. It interprets Jesus' function and authority over against history, but does not define him within history

except in a very specialized sense. The Son of Man, even in Matthew, is primarily a future figure who brings history to an end. Within history Jesus can only be the concealed Son of Man. Yet Matthew insists on a historical definition of Jesus, whereas Mark rejects the possibility of it. For Matthew history itself must be expounded in terms of Jesus' identity.

Matthew repeats the various theories about Jesus' identity (V.14) and then that of Peter (V. 16). This is accepted as the right answer, but one only possible on the basis of revelation from God (V. 17. cf. xi. 25ff.). It is a secret as far as history is concerned. The messianic secret is retained by Matthew here as a historical secret, specifically about Jesus' messiahship (V.20). The historical Jesus was therefore the secret Messiah and the concealed Son of Man.

References for Chapter Three

Section (x)

¹Lohmeyer op. cit. p. 235 and passim.

²Held op. cit. pp. 182ff.

³Held op. cit. pp. 291ff.

⁴cf. Held op. cit. p. 204.

⁵Held op. cit. pp. 205f.

⁶op. cit. p. 242.

⁷cf. Lohmeyer op. cit. p. 256.

⁸cf. J. M. Gibbs "Purpose and Pattern in Matthew's use of the title Son of David", PP.446ff. N.T.S.10, 1964, on the fact that in Matthew Gentiles and the blind alone perceive its significance.

⁹Held op. cit. pp. 197ff.

¹⁰Held op. cit. 207ff.

¹¹Held op. cit. pp. 185ff.

¹²in Bornkamm-Barth-Held, op. cit. pp. 105-126,
particularly pp. 105-116.

¹³Bornkamm in Bornkamm-Barth-Held, op. cit. p. 47.

(xi) The historical fate of Jesus in relation to his identity. Mtt. xvi. 21-xvii. 13.

A new section of Matthew's gospel begins after the disciple's confession of Jesus' messiahship with the period leading to the passion, when Jesus Christ (V.21) began to prophecy his fate in Jerusalem. This is presented as his historical destiny. Matthew has altered Mark by clearly separating off the prophecy of the passion from the confession of messiahship, whilst making it depend on that confession. It has the appearance in Matthew of private instruction to the disciples, as those who know his identity, about what was involved in his being the Messiah. A historical unity is provided for this section, whilst Mark's theological unity has gone. V. 21 no longer speaks obliquely of the Son of Man, but the title can be taken as read, as a designation of Jesus, from V. 13¹ (see Mtt. xxvi. 2). Jesus' historical messiahship is interpreted in terms of the historical fate of the concealed Son of Man, who must go to Jerusalem to die but who will rise again and come in his kingdom (VV. 27f.). Meanwhile he is the pattern we are to follow (VV. 24ff.). This is said in answer to Peter's contradiction of Jesus over the question

of what his messiahship involved (Vv. 22f.). The fate of the Son of Man and of the church, as continuing his task,² demonstrate the historical obstruction of the kingdom of heaven.

For Matthew, the Gospel arises from history and gives instruction about history, on the basis of a revelation granted to the church (Mtt. xvi. 17ff.). This revelation had not to be communicated until certain events took place (xvi. 20, xvii. 9), i.e. the historical death and resurrection of Jesus Christ (xvi. 21), the Son of Man (xvi. 13). The church is built upon this revelation, and in its communication of the Gospel provides a bridge between the events of Jesus' life and the consummation. In the proclamation of Jesus' identity it provides the key to the eschatological significance of history. The sole sign of this in history is the Son of Man, who condemns the unbelief of 'this generation' - in Matthew this is the generation contemporary with Jesus, but also presumably each generation contemporary with the Gospel. The events Matthew is about to record comprise the sign to 'this generation' (Mtt. xii. 39f.). The whole of Matthew's gospel is an account of the historical signs of the times in Jesus' life, death and resurrection. It is an account of the Gospel, as something proclaimed.

in history and as giving the meaning of history. But it bears witness to the church, i.e. the disciples, as the agent of revelation within history. The existence of the church depends on a precise historical recognition of Jesus as the Messiah, by divine revelation, which provides the key to the meaning of historical events. The identity of Jesus provides the key to the relation between his Gospel of the kingdom and history and to his own relationship with history. The link is provided by the conception of Jesus as the Son of Man both within history and at its end. The continued relevance to history of the Gospel of the kingdom is maintained by the church. From now on we are faced by the coming of the Son of Man in glory who will reward every man according to his deeds (V. 27, as Matthew has altered Mk. viii. 38). The presupposition for this coming in glory and for the judgment is the historical fate of Jesus, but Matthew does not set Jesus over against the coming Son of Man as Mark does, because he has systematized the picture. Mtt. xiii. 37ff., xxv. 31ff. show the basis on which he has done so. Eschatological and christological fulfilment have also been united in xvi. 28 by Matthew's alteration of Mk. ix. 1.

The account of the vision (xvii. 9) of the transfigura-

tion of Jesus (xvii. 1ff.) develops further Matthew's use of Mark in the preceding passage. The transfiguration is presented as a revelation to the disciples of Jesus' identity and is linked with an account of what that meant historically and an injunction to secrecy until the historical basis of Jesus' identity has been completed with the resurrection. The actual 'event' of the transfiguration is made more impressive both in itself and in its affect on the disciples. Peter's statement in V. 4 is not referred to directly as a misunderstanding, but the temporary nature of the event and its visionary quality are stressed.

In the resulting discussion (VV. 9ff.) Matthew has again rationalized Mark in a historical manner, and made the passage more of a unity. The disciples do understand the purely temporal reference of V. 9, but go on to ask a question about the scribal assertion of the temporal precedence of Elijah (V.10). Jesus then affirms what the scribes say as being already fulfilled and draws a parallel between the historical fate of Elijah and that of the Son of Man (V. 12). The disciples then understand that Jesus was talking about John the Baptist (V. 13). The scribes are right; but their failure to recognize Elijah is matched by their failure to recognise the Son of Man. The plan of

of what might be called the 'Heilsgeschichte' - the understanding of history as part of the divine plan of salvation - is made plain. The church has the task of proclaiming it.

References for Chapter Three

Section (xi)

¹cf. Tödt pp. 139f.

²cf. Bornkamm, Bornkamm-Barth-Held op. cit., p.48.

(xii) The road to Jerusalem and the passion together
with instruction of the disciples Mtt xvii. 14-
xxiii. 39.

Matthew has shortened and unified the exorcism-story of xvii. 14ff. to concentrate on the question of the faith of the disciples. The father makes a direct approach to Jesus with an account of his son's condition taken from later in the Marcan version (Mk. ix. 22). The disciples' lack of faith is rebuked (V. 17), and the healing performed. The complicated, and probably extended¹, dialogue about faith in Mk. ix. 22b-24 has been omitted in order to concentrate on the question of the faith of the disciples (Vv. 19f.²). Matthew has drawn on other material (cf. Lk. xvii. 6. and Mk xi. 22f.) which provides the sense of Mk ix. 23. Mtt. xvii. 21 is a textual assimilation to Mark.

Mtt. xvii. 22f. takes account of Mark's 'second prediction of the passion' but omits reference to Jesus' attempt to pass secretly through Galilee and to the disciples' lack of understanding. Instead their sorrow reveals their 'little faith'. Little faith rather than lack of understanding is what characterizes the disciples in Matthew.³

The freedom of Jesus' disciples in respect of the law is referred to in Mtt. xvii. 24ff., and at the same time

the need to avoid unnecessary offence. Jesus has fulfilled the law and established it (cf. Rom. iii. 31) on a new principle of freedom, with the proviso that all righteousness is fulfilled. The importance of the passage for Matthew must consist in the circumstances of the church for which he writes.

Matthew has co-ordinated the Marcan sayings about discipleship in xviii. 1ff. and added new material as well as Mk. x. 15. The opening question is about greatness in the kingdom of heaven and the child becomes the type of the disciple. This leads to injunctions for reverence for Christ's 'little ones', backed by the parable of the lost sheep (VV. 12ff.). Church rules (VV. 15ff.), supported by assurance of the presence of Christ in the congregation (V.20), bring the passage to a close. The parable of the unmerciful servant is added (VV. 21ff.) to stress the reasons why forgiveness is demanded.

In the dispute about the law (xix. 3ff.), MK.x. 4f., and 6-9 are reversed to stress Jesus' fundamental attitude which upholds the law, but Matthew provides a modification of its strictness in one particular.

Inheriting the kingdom of heaven is the issue in both xix. 13f., and 15ff. Perfection is the standard for the disciples (xix. 21, cf. v. 48)⁴. Those who follow Jesus

now will share the future glory of the Son of Man (V.28). But the last shall be first and the first last (xix. 31, xx. 1ff.).

The 'third prediction of the passion' (xx. 17ff.) introduces further instruction about the present attitude of the disciples required by the fate of the Son of Man (xx. 20ff.). The disciples' puzzlement and dismay has gone and it is the mother of Zebedee's sons who makes the request for them to have the best seats in the kingdom of the Son of Man, although they themselves answer Jesus' counter-question (V.22). VV. 25ff. now appears as typical private instruction of the disciples about service on the basis of the service of the Son of Man (V.28). Matthew's systematization of the presentation of Jesus as the Son of Man leaves no problems as far as this verse is concerned.

The healing of two blind men which follows (VV. 29ff.) seems to have no special interest for Matthew. Apart from the double address of the son of David (VV. 30f.) the passage is more condensed than the other version of it at Mtt. ix. 27ff.⁵

xxi. 1ff. illustrates the importance to Matthew of Jesus' precise fulfilment of scripture, even to the extent of riding on two animals (VV. 2, 7), ignoring the Semitic parallelism of the quotation. Jesus is greeted as the son of David (V.90). Of course Matthew regards this as factually correct (see

chapters i and ii), but some messianic meaning must be intended as well, even if Matthew disapproves of it on its own. In Jerusalem he is described as the prophet Jesus from Nazareth in Galilee (V.11). In the temple he is again hailed as son of David (V.15). The fig-tree immediately withers (V.19) as an occasion for a private lecture to the disciples on faith (VV. 21f).

The question about Jesus' authority (VV. 23ff.) brings a counter-question about John's authority. Matthew stresses the significance of this in his addition of VV. 28ff. The parable is used to illustrate response to the preaching of John the Baptist, who opened up the way into the kingdom of God (V. 31). The significance of John the Baptist has already been made plain by Matthew (xi. 12ff., xvii. 10ff.). The Marcan parable in VV. 33ff. makes plain the judgment on Israel involved in rejection of the authority of Jesus and John the Baptist (V.43). This is continued in the extended imagery of xxii. 1ff. The present is the time of decision on the basis of which already Jerusalem has been judged (V.7). Meanwhile a mixed company, both bad and good, are accepted (V.10). But there is yet to be a further judgment (VV.11ff.). The presuppositions behind Matthew's use of this parable are the same as in xiii. 36ff.

The four disputes in xxii. 15ff. cover the relation between sacred and secular, the doctrine of the resurrection

based on the divine nature, the summing up of the law and the prophets, and the nature of messiahship. That the Messiah is Son of David is shown to be only a partial truth, although the Pharisees had rejected even that for Jesus.⁶

The long indictment of the Pharisees (xxiii) is addressed to the crowds and the disciples, the servants of the Messiah (V.10). The Pharisees and scribes have misused the keys of the kingdom of heaven and shut themselves out (V.13). They have forgotten the weightier matters of the law - justice, mercy and faith (V.23). VV. 29ff. emphasise the message of the parable of the wicked husbandmen and ascribe the full measure of guilt to 'this generation' (V.36). The historical consequences are made plain (VV. 37ff., cf. Lk. xiii. 34f.), and the further expectation of the return of Jesus introduced (V. 39).

References for Chapter Three

Section (xii)

¹cf. Held op. cit. pp. 190f.

²Held op. cit. pp. 187f.

³cf. Held op. cit. pp. 291ff.

⁴Barth in Bornkamm-Barth-Held pp. 95ff.

⁵see Held op. cit. pp. 219ff.

⁶cf. Gibbs, op. cit. NTS 10.

cf. Wrede 'Jesus als Davidssohn'. Vorträge und Studien pp. 147ff; the passage originally reflects the fact that Jesus was not the expected Messiah, the son of David (if it originates with Jesus it was a rejection of the Messiah's being son of David). But Matthew has developed the conception of Jesus as son of David, though recognizing its inadequacy ~~for~~ Jesus' messiahship.

^{xiv}
 (xiii) The future perspective, - Mtt. xxiv, xxv.

In the next two chapters we are pointed forward through history to the coming judgment with the parousia of the Son of Man and the end of the age. The starting-point for this is the prophecy of the destruction of the temple (xxiv. 2), but the question which leads to what follows is concerned explicitly with two separate things, history and apocalyptic (V. 3b). ~~Matthew~~ Matthew presumes a relationship between them in that he is able to proceed from one to the other. The basis for this is his understanding of Jesus as the Son of Man. The disciples are warned against false Messiahs (V.5) and told of the affliction of the church (VV.9ff.). The end will come after this Gospel has been preached in the whole world (V.14). Meanwhile, in the Judaeian affliction there will be false Christs and false prophets, but the coming of the Son of Man will be no secret (V. 27). After that affliction the parousia will take place (VV. 29ff.). Suddenness will be the mark of the end (VV. 32ff.). This theme is extended together with the Marcan command to watch (see xxiv. 42, xxv. 13). Ignorance of the time takes account of the delay in the parousia (see xxiv. 48, xxv. 1ff) — ~~1~~¹. The coming of the Son of Man will be unexpected and sudden (xxiv. 27f., 37ff.), but it is not to be thought of as far

off (xxiv. 48) or near (xxv. 1ff.)². The fact that the parousia seemed to have been delayed was the cause of this interpretation. But Matthew stresses the connection between the present and the future, even though no precise knowledge of the time of the end is possible.

The future coming of the Son of Man will, however, be open and clear to all, unlike his earlier coming. The future coming involves a judgment which rests on his earlier coming in concealment (xxv. 31ff.). The Son of Man will then welcome the heirs of the kingdom (V.34). He is the returning Lord, just as in parables he is both the departing and the returning Lord³ (see Mtt. vii. 21ff., xxv. 11, 37, 44, xxiv. 45ff.). The Son of Man who comes as judge is of necessity identified with Jesus (cf. Mtt. xix. 28). The contrast is between the two conditions of the Son of Man, not between Jesus and the Son of Man. Jesus is identified as much with the Son of Man, and vice-versa, at each end.

References for Chapter Three

xiv

Section (xiii)

¹cf. Bornkamm 'Die Verzögerung der Parusie'
In Memoriam Ernst Lohmeyer 1951 pp. 116ff. - xxv. 19.

²cf. Bornkamm, Bornkamm-Barth-Held p. 23.

³cf. Tödt op. cit. pp. 82ff., and Bornkamm 'Enderwartung
und Kirche im Matthäus-Evangelium' Background of the New
Testament and its Eschatology 1956 pp. 222-260.

xv
 (xiv) The passion of the Son of Man, - Mtt. xxvi,
xxvii.

xxvi. 2 has been created by Matthew out of Mk. xiv.

1a and the Marcan sayings about the passion of the Son of Man, but with specific mention of crucifixion. It provides a break from, and a link with, the preceding discourse and connects history and apocalyptic christologically.

At xxvi. 13 Matthew again refers to 'this Gospel'. The Gospel is seen as uniting Jesus' earthly life and the time of the church, and its preaching (κηρυχθῆ) includes an account (λαληθήσεται) of the events of Jesus' life. Matthew's gospel serves the 'kerygma' by its combination of Jesus' words and deeds and the proclamation of the church, which reveals the significance of those words and deeds. 'This Gospel' is the combination of these two things and is found in the church's preaching, on the basis of that of Jesus. A proper account of Jesus' life and teaching is therefore in Matthew's view fundamental to the Gospel, though he does not identify the two. He places supreme importance on the revelation to the disciples and on the foundation of the church on the basis of that revelation and from their proclamation of it. But he is

positive that it is revelation of and from the historical Jesus. The Gospel has become in some sense an account of the historical Jesus, in that his life is its basis. Whereas for Mark the Gospel alone shows Jesus to be the Messiah, after his lifetime, for Matthew, basic to the Gospel is that life and the fact that he was the Messiah. But that life was under the control of God's will and part of the fulfilment of his purposes behind history (xxvi. 18, 24, 45, 53f.).

Matthew emphasizes equally a distinction between Jesus then and Jesus in the future. This is shown in the frequent use of ἀπ' ἄρτι (xxiii. 39, xxvi. 29, 64, cf. xi. 12). The question whether Jesus was the Messiah, the Son of God, is thrown back at the high-priest by Jesus and answered in terms of his future condition from then on (xxvi. 64). It is the Christian hope which is blasphemy to the high-priests, who have already rejected his historical messiahship. For Matthew the two questions of Jesus' past and future status are one, and can be answered together. He may or may not be recognized in the former but the later will be visible to all. Both are related and one's standing in the future will be determined by one's perception of Jesus' past status; they are inseparable in the church's

proclamation and faith. What follows is the answer of the Jewish leaders to their own question (VV. 66,68). What remains is contained in xxii. 39, xxvi. 29, 64¹. There is no stress, as in Lk. xxii. 69, on an intermediate period, but rather on the dialectical relationship between the two conditions of Jesus. Between them comes the preaching of the Gospel by the church. The actual account of the crucifixion stresses the rejection of Jesus by the Jewish people and their guilt (xxvii. 17, 22f., 25, 40, 42f.). Pilate's wife declares Jesus a righteous man (V.19) and the centurion states that he was the Son of God (V. 54).

References for Chapter Three

Section ^{xv}(~~xiv~~)

¹cf. T8dt op. cit. pp. 76-78.

(xv) The resurrection and exaltation of the Son,- Mtt. xxviii.

Matthew has drawn together the Marcan narrative of the empty tomb and extended it. The resurrection is stressed as a historical event by the setting of the watch, and as a divine event by the descent of the angel. The Marcan 'ending' is altered so that the women run to tell the disciples, reinforced by an appearance of Jesus (VV. 8ff.), and the disciples go to meet Jesus in Galilee (VV. 16ff.). They receive their commission, and Jesus announces that all authority is given him in heaven and on earth and promises his continued presence till the end of time. This ending is made possible by Matthew's alteration of Mark's last verse, but something like it must have been intended if Mark added Mk. xvi. 7(=Mk. xiv. 28) to the tradition. Matthew's ending connects the end of his gospel with the beginning of the work of the church, under the presence and power of the Son of Man, whose exaltation is referred to in V. 18 (cf. Dan. vii. 14).

Chapter Four. The concealed messiahship in Luke.

(A) The state of the discussion.

According to Wrede,¹ Luke kept some aspects of the Marcan secrecy theme and gave his own interpretation to them, but omitted others, without understanding them, or retained them without attributing any special significance to them. Luke retained and developed the notion that at the resurrection the disciples received instruction and insight which they had not had previously². Passages of dialogue in the gospel and Acts, between the risen Jesus and his disciples, teach the disciples about the necessity of Jesus' suffering and death, and the delay of the eschatological consummation. The disciples thereby learn what they did not understand before about the nature of Jesus' messiahship. Thus it is particularly the prophecies of the passion and its necessity that the disciples are represented as not understanding during Jesus' lifetime³. Other examples of failure are modified⁴. Luke stresses therefore the difference for the disciples between Jesus' lifetime, prior to the passion, and the time after the resurrection. In Luke the theme of the disciples' lack of understanding is historically orientated, in the sense that the full nature of Jesus' messiahship could not be fully understood before the passion. There is a dogmatic aspect

to this⁵ since for Luke it was not possible to understand Jesus' messiahship without the passion, presumably because that was part of its historical fulfilment. Other aspects of the Marcan secrecy-theme are in some cases taken over without receiving any special significance⁶. Commands to silence about Jesus' messiahship appear as attempts to avoid false conceptions about it, which the passion should correct⁷. The time was not ripe during Jesus' life.

Wrede is not clear whether Luke thought of Jesus as already Messiah, but not properly known as such during his lifetime, or as only becoming Messiah after the passion and resurrection. Acts ii. 36 reflects for him knowledge that Jesus' messiahship was recognized only at the resurrection⁸ not the viewpoint of Luke. Luke seems to take account of wrong expectations before the passion, which the passion corrected, and that the risen Jesus showed that the passion was the proper way for him to fulfil his messianic destiny⁹. Full and proper realization of Jesus' messiahship could only come with the passion and resurrection. Secrecy about it was orientated towards the future. But Luke is judged on the basis of whether he has understood Mark, rather than in himself¹⁰. It is of course true that Luke wrote in conscious dependence on Mark, and corrected him, but his

interpretation does deserve independent consideration as well, since his relationship to earlier tradition and the primitive kerygma is as close as Mark's, although he is dependent on Mark for the theme of secrecy.

As with Matthew, Sjöberg's judgment of Luke is based on whether he has preserved the authentic picture of the concealed Messiah. He finds behind the Lucan material, as that of Mark and Matthew, evidence of the concept of a concealed, rather than a proleptic or future, Messiah, but that Luke has not retained the conception in its purity, any more than Mark or Matthew. The evangelist's interest lies rather in the secrecy of the passion of Jesus¹¹.

Sjöberg ignores the significance of the evangelists' use of earlier tradition in the construction of their gospels, and in particular the significance for this of the theme of secrecy. This prevents him from recognizing how the gospels present the relationship between the Gospel and history in the kerygmatic tradition in the form of lives of Jesus. Two of the synoptic evangelists have been shown to have had consciously specific and systematic approaches to the question in the construction of their gospels, the form of which presupposes some kind of relation between Gospel and history. This should be the case with Luke too.

To treat the gospel material apart from its use and context in the gospels themselves in favour of a supposed context in Jesus' life will not lead to a proper understanding of the material as it exists in the gospels nor as it existed in previous tradition, nor is it the way to ascertain the relation of the material to history. The gospels are the sole points of reference for any motif in them, and it is not possible to abstract any motif as a dogmatic item against which everything else is to be judged. The secrecy-theme can only be itself judged according to its place and use in the various gospels and what function it performs within them. The contention of this study is that this method reveals it to have an interpretative function, secondary to the material included, though formative for the ordering of that material in the gospels in accordance with the interests governing their creation in the form of lives of Jesus using the kerygmatic tradition of his deeds and words. It is the means by which the relation to history and the kerygmatic structure of the material itself are both accounted for. By this means the new setting of the material in the gospels recognizes the presuppositions of the material about history and its formation in the preaching of the

Gospel, and illustrates the implicit relation between history and the Gospel in the tradition itself.

A valuable study of the construction of the gospel of Luke, though without dealing with the messianic secret, is that of Hans Conzelmann,¹² It was asserted above that Mark was conscious of the fact that his gospel presupposed the kerygma and had the task of expounding it in relation to the historical Jesus. Mark kept history and Gospel distinct, whilst asserting a meaningful relationship between them, in that the latter presupposed the former. The concept of secrecy expressed this relationship by asserting that Jesus' messiahship was a secret as far as Jesus' life was concerned in that it was not then proclaimed or understood. The basis for and the beginning of the kerygma, which Mark's gospel recorded, was the resurrection, as well as the point of continuity between the kerygma and the historical Jesus. Matthew, it was said, historicized this 'story' in terms of a revelatory process behind the events of history. The secrecy was seen as an aspect of history itself, although Mark had stressed the limitations of history itself. For Matthew the kerygma was rooted in history, in the events of Jesus' life, death and resurrection, understood as those of the concealed Son

of Man who would later be revealed in glory. For Mark, the life, death and resurrection of Jesus were rather the presupposition for the expectation of the Son of Man.

Conzelmann shows that Luke thought of his gospel as in some way purely a historical narrative. Whereas Matthew had differentiated between profane history and his concept of a 'Heilsgeschichte' which the events of history served, Luke stresses history as such. This is yet a further development in the use of Mark.

Luke's preface showed that he intended to give the factual, historical foundation of the kerygma, although he wrote after the kerygma. But he distinguishes his narrative from the kerygma, although it describes the basis and subject-matter of it. Here are to be found Luke's justification for writing and the 'raison d'être' of his work. With Luke the form, gospel, has acquired a function as a literary type in the possession of the Christian church. Luke probably regarded Mark at least as a precursor in this task, but as inadequate. He intended to systematize Mark's account of the historical presupposition of the Gospel.

We see here a beginning of that attitude which looks to history for the basic facts of the Gospel as recited in the creed¹³. This means that a particular period of history

has acquired significance of its own. But that history is distinguished from the kerygma which follows it¹⁴. The period of Jesus' life is distinguished from the time of the church, and historical significance given to each period. This is an alteration of Mark since Jesus' life is regarded separately by Mark, not so much in itself but rather as partaking of the limitations of all history, and of concern as the particular history at the root of the Gospel. The whole of history acquires for Luke an importance of its own on the basis of that bit of history¹⁵. Jesus' historicity and his life represent the ἀρχή of the Gospel as its historical beginning or foundation. Thus the historical Jesus is proclaimed by the Gospel as the Messiah and presumably could only be so proclaimed when that life was completed. Mark's continual dialectic between the historical Jesus and the Gospel no more obtains. Luke does not, like Matthew, distinguish between actual, or profane, history, and 'Heilsgeschichte', or 'redemptive history'¹⁶.

The church, like Jesus, exists in the midst of world history until the parousia. The parousia is at the end just as creation was at the beginning of history. In the midst of this history came Jesus the Messiah. This is the time of

ignorance, but the disciples have been given the key to history as the basis of their preaching. The clue to the meaning and purpose of history is in the appearance of Jesus in history, showing redemption as its goal. Of central importance within history are the death and resurrection of Jesus, only understood later by the disciples, of which the nations were ignorant of and therefore guiltless.

Revelation is a matter of history and failure to perceive it a mark of ignorance. The ignorance of the disciples was dispelled at the resurrection (Lk. xxiv. 25ff.), and their task thereafter is to dispel the ignorance of the nations about the meaning and goal of history by means of the apostolic kerygma. Luke's gospel describes the historical justification for this in the life, death and resurrection of Jesus.¹⁷ But history still required the kerygma for its meaning to be made plain.

Thus Luke saw the life of Jesus as part of the historical realization of the Gospel. The relation in Mark between history and the Gospel has been historicized and the historical Jesus has become unequivocally the subject of the Gospel proclamation, with a present expectation of the next stage, i.e. the return of Jesus after the Gospel has been preached. The Gospel will be fulfilled at the end of history,

as the point of universal revelation. History itself is viewed as ultimately fulfilled in redemption, without real contradiction. The end of history is the eschatological event. The Gospel consists for Luke in the proclamation - εὐαγγελίζεσθαι - of events, in particular of those of Jesus' life, death and resurrection by the church, situated between the decisive events of the resurrection and ascension, and the parousia. His use of the Son of Man sayings will be shown to reflect the christological aspect of this understanding of the relation between history and eschatology.

References for Chapter Four

Section 'A'

¹Das Messiasgeheimnis.

²ibid pp. 165ff.

³ibid pp. 169ff.

⁴ibid pp. 167f.

⁵ibid p. 171.

⁶ibid pp. 172ff.

⁷ibid pp. 175ff.

⁸ibid p. 214.

⁹ibid pp. 240ff.

¹⁰ibid p. 242.

¹¹Der Verborgene Menschensohn pp. 142ff.

¹²Die Mitte der Zeit. 1954 Eng. Tr. The Theology of St. Luke.
London 1960.

¹³Conzelmann ibid p. 11.

¹⁴Conzelmann ibid p. 13.

¹⁵ibid pp. 13ff.

¹⁶Conzelmann ibid p. 17, n.2.

¹⁷This is the basis for his attempt to describe 'the Life of Jesus' cf. E. Käsemann 'Das Problem des historischen Jesus'. Z.Th.K. 1954 p. 137, Exegetische Versuche I p.199, Essays p. 30, and E. Haenchen Die Apostelgeschichte Göttingen 1959, p.87.

(B) Exegetical analysis of Luke's gospel.

The difference between Luke and Mark is shown by Luke's introduction (i. 1-4), though he regards himself as bringing the work of his predecessors to completion. His intention is expressly to present the historical basis of the kerygma from the beginning (ἀπ' ἀρχῆς). What follows is not itself kerygma, but the account of the church's kerygma contained in the gospel consists of summaries of the historical events. Before the Gospel there was a particular life (see Acts i.1), both chronologically and theologically prior to it, just as the gospel is prior to Acts.

The difference between Matthew and Luke consists in the fact that history for Luke is a single system in which both the natural and the supernatural play their part. There are, as befits a Greek as distinct from a Hebrew mind, two levels in one universe, rather than two ways of viewing history. As far as history goes Luke is a monist and a positivist (see his stress on the physical aspect of the resurrection and ascension and the incarnational aspect of the nativity, whereas Matthew has more in common with the dualist and the metaphysician - though his understanding of history is dynamic and not static, e.g. at ii.23. Mark's existential dialectic with

history, and Matthew's apocalyptic dialectic with ⁱⁿ history between revelation and concealment, have become a dialectical process of history itself, i. e. history which has to be experienced and interpreted, but which has its own logic and authenticity. We understand history as ourselves involved in history, and must relate ourselves to it. But substance and reality are one and indivisible, though it is possible to be ignorant about the nature of an event (xxiii. 34). History is given to us and demands some attitude from us, since we are involved in it. This is for Luke particularly true of the history of Jesus, but understanding is mediated to us by the Gospel. Secrecy reflects the need for interpretation of history and the fact that it is a process as yet incomplete. Luke takes out of Mark the demand to come to terms with the historical events that have already taken place, as a guide to what has yet to take place. For Mark too the historical events are not irrelevant, but they are useless without the Gospel. Luke's work is necessary to contradict the way H. J. Ebeling took Mark to imply the irrelevance of history. But for Luke, too, it took the risen Christ to expound to the disciples the meaning of what had taken place, who, in Luke's second volume expound this meaning in the kerygma.

Only after that could Luke's gospel have been written. Luke clearly explains the function and presupposition of a gospel. It presupposes the kerygma and presents history as the presupposition of the kerygma. The kerygma, however, only began after the resurrection. Those who preach it must not only be eye-witnesses of Jesus, but also eye-witnesses of the resurrection.

Luke was dissatisfied with the way Mark presented the relationship between history, i.e. the life of Jesus and the kerygma¹ or, at least, he wanted to separate them visibly and historically, whilst showing that one depended on the other. His gospel is solely about the historical presupposition of the Gospel (i. 4), and not a presentation of history and Gospel in dialectic. Thus he uses the form of Mark's gospel for this purpose and follows it by an account of the apostolic preaching. Because of this he does not need Mark's secrecy-theme, apart from its temporal significance. He has historicized the relation between history and kerygma. Like Matthew, he changes Mark because compelled to do so by a different conception of what he was writing about and a different use of the gospel form because a different method of presentation was needed. The greater stress on history made nonsense of the secrecy-motif in its Marcan form, though its implications for the relation-

ship between the life of Jesus and the kerygma are recognized.

Matthew and Luke try, in different ways, to give a quality to the particular history they describe and they alter the concept of the two aeons, which persists in Mark, into one of three periods in order to give a particular quality to Jesus' earthly life and historical existence. But this reflexion is from the standpoint of the time of the church, and already implicit in Mark. But Mark is more interested in the Gospel than in history, even though the former could not exist without the latter. Matthew and Luke are concerned to give more weight to what their work contains and to show the relationship between the history they record and the Gospel. The way the Son of Man sayings are used reflects this development in both Matthew and Luke in describing the historical presupposition of the Gospel and its relation to the ultimate fulfilment in the person of Jesus.

References for Chapter Four

Section 'B'

¹Conzelmann op. cit. p. 11.

- (i) 'An account of those things which have been fulfilled amongst us.... from the beginning', - Lk. i. 1-4, 5ff.

Luke does not set out to write a biography as such, but to give the historical basis for the kerygma (i.1-4). He does this by an immediate reference to history and the temporal and historical setting for the first event, the birth of John the Baptist. But the event in question is proclaimed (εὐαγγελίσασθαι , V. 19) by an angel. Angels proclaim the significance of events on earth in the world of men and human history (cf. ii. 10, εὐαγγελίζομαι). The realms of God and man are adjacent and contemporary (ii.14). During the reign of Herod the Great, is born Christ the Lord, of whose kingdom there shall be no end (i. 32f.). The Son of God is conceived by the Holy Spirit and born in history (i. 35). The work of John the Baptist is in the spirit and power of Elijah (i.17). But the historical aspect has the greater stress, and the angels only witness to its significance. Fulfilment is found in historical events as they reflect heavenly decisions. The worlds of angels and men are two levels of one universe, like earth and heaven (ii.15). History is the sphere in which God's designs are being progressively realized and revealed to men, although the significance of the crucial events has to be proclaimed and ignorance removed.

This will be of significance later when Luke's treatment of eschatology in relation to history has to be discussed. The full purpose of God is hidden in heaven, but is plain in historical events, interpreted by the Gospel. A linear development connects the present with the future, and the future is guaranteed by the presence in heaven of the Son of Man. But first he had to be born on earth.

(ii) The birth of Jesus, - Lk. ii.

Jesus' birth, like that of John is firmly dated (ii.1f). The birth of Jesus in Bethlehem, the city of David, is the result, for Luke, of historical circumstance (VV. 3f.), but it is also proclaimed by the angel as that of Christ the Lord (V.10). Heaven and earth, angels and men, are both concerned in the event (VV. 14f.). Event and proclamation fit together (VV. 17, 20). The child's name is that which had been spoken of by the angel (V. 21, cf. i. 61-63).

The birth represents a new period in history after a long period of waiting, symbolized by old Symeon and Anna (ii. 25f., 29-32, 37f.). A sign appears as practically a historical event (VV. 12, 34), although open to contradiction. 'Christ the Lord' is the historical Jesus (VV. 11, 26). Jesus is under the law, as a bondage from which one is to be freed (VV. 21f., 39, 41f.), just like his submission to his parents (V.51), although he has a higher obedience and service (V. 49). Lack of understanding and amazement are recorded (VV. 47, 50). The significance of the time as that of fulfilment is characterized by the canticles in i. 46ff., 68ff., ii. 29ff.

(iii) John the Baptist and Jesus, - Lk. iii.

John's ministry is dated carefully (iii.1f.), and its locality and the details of it are given at greater length, as is the quotation from Is. x1. John is a teacher as well as a prophet (VV. 7-14), but he is carefully distinguished from the Christ (V.15). The 'Q' sayings in VV. 16f. are made into an indication of this differentiation. John and Jesus are clearly contrasted (cf. Acts xiii. 23ff., and for the difference between the two Baptisms, Acts i. 5, xi. 16). John belongs to the old and marks the point of transition to the new (see Lk. xvi. 16, Acts x. 37, xiii. 25.)¹. John was fathered in the law and is the high-point of prophecy. The almost incidental removal of John from the scene², is set against the baptism of Jesus in which his divine parentage is proclaimed (VV. 21f.). Jesus' human parentage and his relationship with his past ancestry is almost irrelevant (see V. 23 and VV.24ff.), although it is traced back to God (V.38). With Jesus a new beginning is made in human history, corresponding with that of Adam.

John and Jesus represent the end and the beginning of two periods and their chronological relationship is stressed. The two baptisms are differentiated as those of water and

Spirit and Acts will describe that by the Spirit (see Acts 1.5). Eschatology has been historicized in terms of history moving towards its close. John has already brought one period to a close; Jesus opens another.

References for Chapter Four

Section (iii)

¹cf. Conzelmann op. cit. pp. 22ff.

²cf. Conzelmann op. cit. p. 21.

(iv) The day of salvation, - Lk. iv.

The first thing Jesus does is to defeat the devil, in the power of the Spirit (iv. 1ff.) and for a period the devil retires (V.13). This is the signal for Jesus' Galilean activity (VV.14f.). The meaning of this is demonstrated in the Lucan passage VV.16ff. The pure Marcan eschatological preaching has disappeared.

Luke's account of Jesus' rejection in Nazareth is programmatic for his understanding of Jesus' ministry as a whole. The 'to-day' of Jesus' life and ministry is Luke's theme (V.21)¹, and it is this which gives meaning to scripture (VV. 17ff.), not vice-versa as in Matthew, V. 23a refers to the passion, but for the moment Jesus escapes (V.30). Jesus' historical rejection is referred to in line with that of prophets in the past in their own country. The incident in Nazareth stands for the offence of Jesus' historicity generally, especially in Israel.

Things are different in Capernaum (VV. 31ff.). Here Luke draws on Mark to stress the power of Jesus (VV.32, 36). This must be the power of the Spirit of V. 14. which is greater than that of the devil (V. 13, cf. Acts x. 38). Luke has used Mark's reference to Jesus' ἐξουσία in the sense of power in word and deed (V. 36), from the Spirit.²

~~On the change in meaning of the words~~

~~and~~

~~in Luke,~~²

The differences between Mark and Luke are christological in that Mark's eschatological emphasis has been historicized. The actual exercise of power is the point in question in Luke rather than the question about Jesus' authority.

Luke retains from Mark the fact that the nature of Jesus' authority is not generally perceived (see VV. 34f). The period of Jesus' earthly life is one of the exercise of power, but without general acceptance and not openly authenticated (see V. 41, expanded from Mark). Jesus' rejection was part of the divine plan for which³ ~~men~~ were not necessarily to blame. The account of the rejection at Nazareth is more an account of Jesus' rejection of his own country on the basis of a divine pattern. In Acts the kerygma will offer to the Jews the chance of salvation, although they were responsible for the crucifixion. But, during Jesus' lifetime, the kerygma was not yet, because Jesus had not been glorified. Men were ignorant of the divine purpose before that (see Acts ii. 22ff.). Any other way would have avoided the passion (Lk. ix. 21f.), according to the temptation of the devil. Guilt lies in rejecting the kerygma, not in the crucifixion itself (Acts iii. 12ff., 18f.).

The one whom the Jews crucified God made Lord and Christ (Acts ii. 36). Before the passion it was not possible to proclaim Jesus as the Christ.

The theme of secrecy with regard to Jesus' messiahship has been historicized in that proclamation was made to depend on fulfilment of God's purposes in history in Jesus' life, death and resurrection, on which depended salvation and future redemption, as well as Jesus' Lordship and Messiahship. Even the passion illustrates the power of Jesus in that it was chosen, and could be avoided before the time was ripe (iv. 30). Jesus' messiahship is for Luke a historical fact, which was fulfilled in history and had to be fulfilled before it was openly proclaimed. During Jesus' lifetime it was the kingdom of God, which Jesus proclaimed (V.43), though the verbal content of this preaching is not specified, unless it is that of Jesus' sermon in Nazareth that the time has been fulfilled, as evidenced by the acts of power. This is a proclamation still valid in retrospect, in the Gospel proclamation of the fulfilment of salvation in Jesus⁴.

References for Chapter Four

Section (iv)

¹cf. Conzelmann p. 103.

²*On the change in meaning of the words $\delta\upsilon\acute{\nu}\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma$ and $\xi\gamma\omega\upsilon\sigma\iota\acute{\alpha}$ in Luke, cf. Barrett The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition pp. 69ff., Conzelmann op. cit. pp. 181ff.*

³Caird St. Luke p. 38.

⁴cf. Conzelmann op. cit. p. 195.

(v) The call of disciples and the signs of Jesus' power,-Lk. v. 1-vi. 11.

The authority of Jesus' word in summoning disciples lies in his deeds, in the mighty catch of fish. The future work of the disciples is illustrated as well as Jesus' power. Simon Peter reacts to the power of Jesus' word in his deed. But this is meant to lead to recognition of the person of Jesus. There is a Gospel involved in Jesus' life, in his words and deeds (see the fact that Gospel in Luke is a verb not a noun), which the kerygma of the church must articulate in terms of Jesus' person (see Acts x. 34ff.). The disciples were witnesses of the first in order to preach the second (Acts x. 39, 41, 42). Jesus' messiahship came from his anointing by the Spirit and with power (Acts x. 38) and was completed with the resurrection. Luke has developed in a historical direction Mark's concept of the christological realization of the eschatological preaching, or Gospel, of Jesus. He has done so by stressing the fulfilment involved in the 'today' of Jesus' life and ministry, as the content of the Gospel of Jesus, and based on the presence of the Spirit in power in Jesus' words and deeds. This is a development of themes already present in Mark. Into this framework Luke fits the messianic secret (iv. 41). He

never forgets the necessity for the kerygma about Jesus' person, which is the subject of Acts. Even in Jesus' sermon on 'to-day', there is reflection on the historical ^{non-}acceptance of Jesus and his message. The question in iv. 36 is concerned with the message, not, as in Mark (i. 22, 27), with Jesus' authority, but it involves the question of Jesus' identity (vv. 34f., 41).

The Marcan collection of disputes, prefaced by the cleansing of the leper, follow (v. 12ff., 17ff., vi. 1-11), much the same as in Mark. Luke recounts them in clear historical terms and the crowd react with wonder and fear at the strange things of the day of salvation (v. 26). But the miracles have no further effect, although word of them gets around (v. 15), and their teaching is made plain (v. 24, vi. 5). The sole result is enmity (vi. 11).

Mark had used these pericopae, as part of the kerygmatic tradition which referred to history, to show both the inadequacy and witness of history, as both were made plain by the kerygma. Luke has used the stories as history, which required the kerygma for its meaning to be made plain, though it is basic to the kerygma and became the subject of the kerygma after the resurrection. Whereas Matthew drew out the theological, or christological, implications for history

of Mark's account to show that Jesus was the rejected Messiah and son of David, who, as Son of Man, is more than the original titles conveyed and who will triumph over history in the end, Luke has drawn out the implications for history of its relationship with the kerygma. The life of Jesus was a necessary piece of history, entirely under divine control, which had to take place to bring the Gospel to completion. Thus he stresses the contemporary ignorance ~~of~~ Jesus' identity at the time among people at large, although they witness to the events which are recorded in the Gospel and proclaimed in the kerygma. Mark's concern with the historical Jesus' relation to the Gospel has been transposed into a concern with his life in its relation to ~~the~~ kerygma. But for Luke too there is no purely historical understanding of Jesus from his life, since understanding comes from the kerygma, after Jesus' life, death and resurrection (see Lk. ix. 21f., 36). But when the kerygma came it spoke about the historical Jesus and used traditions of his deeds and words. Thus Luke insists, on the basis of the ^{kerygma} (that the historical Jesus was the Messiah, ~~historical~~, and that the meaning of messiahship is to be understood on the basis of Jesus' life. The 'testimony' of v. 14 is the testimony of event to the

future kerygma, and Jesus' healing of the paralytic is a demonstration for the kerygma of the Son of Man's ability to forgive sins (v. 24a). There are for Luke fixed events of history the meaning of which is disclosed by the *kerygma*, after the passion, and resurrection and ascension. The Son of Man is simply Jesus as proclaimed by the kerygma whether he is thought of as historical person or as ascended to heaven (Lk. ix. 22, xxii. 69, xxiv. 7) where he waits to come again (Acts vii. 55f.) having fulfilled in history the role of the Messiah (xxiv. 26, 44ff.). The historical Jesus was this kind of Messiah, and it is the task of the disciples, as witnesses to these things, to make this known and proclaim the power of the Son of Man with respect to earthly affairs (v.24). For Luke the disputes do not, as in Mark, reflect the continuing dialectic with history involved in preaching Jesus, but the historical secret of his identity and earthly power in relation to history, which the kerygma reveals, first to the Jews, then to the Gentiles. This is part of Luke's historical 'rationalizing' of Mark, in terms of the historical relation between the origin of the Gospel and the Gospel itself, though it

involves neglect of Mark's concern that the historical Jesus is still, as subject of the Gospel, the secret Messiah, even if the history is rationally explained as the prelude to the ascension or if it is asserted that God has, despite historical appearances, made this Jesus both Lord and Christ. Luke's removal of the essential rejection of Jesus into the context of Acts, as made with regard to the kerygma about Jesus, does not really change this, though the result is tidier in that history, i.e. the life of Jesus, and kerygma are clearly differentiated within history. But even this is only apparently the case, since Luke's gospel is itself constructed out of kerygmatic material and on the basis of that material. Yet Luke is right that a meaningful decision with regard to Jesus is made on the basis of the kerygma and could not have been made during Jesus' lifetime (xxiii.34), even though it is still with regard to the historical Jesus that men must decide.

The difference between Mark and Luke lies in the stress in Luke on history and on the significance of Jesus' presence in history as the physician who healed sinners, the bridegroom, and the Lord of the sabbath. These stories are for Luke part of the historical basis of the kerygma of the Son of Man.

(vi) The role of the disciples, - Lk. vi. 12ff.

Lk. vi. 12ff. portrays the disciples as the future apostles (V. 13b). The list is, with one exception, the same as that in Acts i. 13. Acts i. 15ff. illustrates the importance of the list. These are the witnesses who will have the task of proclaiming the kerygma. Meanwhile they are with Jesus. But they do not yet understand what it is they are learning and witnessing. For them the secret is a matter of time, and it will be divulged at the resurrection. The secret is about the outcome of Jesus' life and the nature of his messiahship. The sermon on the plain (VV. 20ff.) marks out the blessedness of the disciples, setting present discomfort, endured for the Son of Man's sake (V.22), against future reward.

(vii) The earthly ministry of words and deed, -Lk. vii, viii.

The following two pericopae are non-Markan, one from 'Q', the other peculiar to Luke. They serve to introduce the 'Q' passage containing the question of the Baptist about Jesus' identity which is answered with reference to Jesus' deeds themselves. This fits Luke's factual account of miracles, which stresses the miraculous element itself.¹ The verdict of the bystanders is contained in V. 16, but John wants to know more. John himself is designated as the historical forerunner, but not as Elijah (cf. Matt. xi. 14), since that identification was connected with an eschatological scheme which Luke has discarded of. his omission after ix 36 of Mk. ix. 11ff., originally ^{following} ix.1. He is less than the least in the kingdom of God (V. 28). According to Lk. xvi. 16 John stands historically at the end of the line of the law and the prophets, and before the preaching of the kingdom of God and its availability to 'all'. The kingdom of God would seem to be, for Luke, the timeless content of Jesus' preaching and that which his preaching makes available to men, (Lk. xvii.21) and which he himself guarantees to men (Lk. xxii. 28ff.)

VV. 31ff. stress the perversity of the generation which rejected both Jesus and John the Baptist. The

historical Jesus is again presented as the Son of Man, the friend of publicans and sinners.

The latter point is illustrated in the Lucan pericope of the anointing of Jesus in vii. 36ff. (see V. 39). The parable in VV. 41ff., which fits V. 47b but not 47a, illustrates further the contrast of VV. 29f. The secondary nature of the end of the pericope (VV. 48-50) is clear from the secondary use of the sayings in VV. 48 and 50 (about faith), cf. v. 20 and viii. 48; for V. 49 cf. v.20. This is a demonstration of the power of the Son of Man (see v. 24). Jesus is the Lord who forgives sinners and expects love in return. The whole pericope seems to be another version of Mk. xiv. 3 (contrast Mk. xiv. 4ff.).

Lk. viii. 1 describes Jesus' earthly activity as that of proclaiming - *κηρύσσων* - and preaching - *εὐαγγελιζόμενος*

- the kingdom of God, surrounded by the twelve.

In VV. 4ff. an example is given of this preaching. This is all that is left of Mark's parable-chapter.

In each gospel the parable-chapter is significant for the structure and composition of that gospel. Thus Mark iv teaches that the mystery of Jesus' eschatological preaching is to be disclosed to his disciples in the Gospel and Mtt. xiii that it is disclosed to the disciples in terms of the significance of Jesus' life and person for the future fulfil-

ment of God's saving purposes at the far end of history. This is in accordance with the fact that Mark is concerned with the relation between the Gospel and the historical Jesus, and Matthew with the significance of Jesus' life for the Gospel. Luke is simply concerned with the historical place of Jesus over against the kerygma, and with his life as the basis of that kerygma. Thus in this chapter he is concerned to present the preaching of Jesus about the kingdom, as something given to the disciples to understand, and to proclaim openly in the future. The kingdom of God is a non-historical entity to be realised only when history comes to an end, but within history men decide about it, and do so on the basis of the preaching of Jesus. The guarantee of that preaching is found in Jesus himself, after his death, resurrection, and ascension to heaven. These events are the basis of the kerygma of the church, which originated in the historical preaching of Jesus himself which Luke records here together with the assertion that the mysteries of the kingdom are given to the disciples. They come to know these mysteries by observing Jesus' life, death and resurrection, and later proclaim what they know (VV. 16f.). It is the historical relation between Jesus and the kerygma of the church that concerns Luke, whilst Mark was concerned

about the relation between history and the Gospel and Matthew about the place of history in the Gospel. For Luke, history, i.e. the life of Jesus, is simply the presupposition of the Gospel. History is a process which precedes the realization of the kingdom of God and involves by necessity a number of events which must take place before the end. The nature of these events is revealed to the disciples. The key figure in these events is Jesus himself. Certain of these events concern his historical existence and must take place before the disciples can proclaim the Gospel. But already the historical Jesus preaches the kingdom of God, i.e. the fact that history is under his control and serves his purposes. For Luke, the 'mysteries of the kingdom' include the place of Jesus' life in relation to those processes. That is what is spoken of as being at present concealed, but which will be revealed in the future (V. 17), and it is about this that the disciples are instructed, though for the time being they do not understand it. The secret in Luke is that of the history itself and of the meaning of what takes place, i.e. the content of Jesus' Lordship and Messiahship. The meaning of the christological titles is secondary in Luke to the historical events of Jesus' life and his ascension to heaven,

and the role he will perform in bringing history to an end. (cf. the way he combines them all in xxii. 67ff.). The titles are defined, not questioned, by history, because history itself is under the control of God's purposes.

Luke is concerned, too, with the disciples as those who hear Jesus' preaching of the kingdom of God and observe his deeds, and who form the nucleus of the church, to proclaim to the world the significance of what they have witnessed. The 'mysteries of the kingdom' are the meaning and significance of historical events, particularly those of Jesus' life, death, and resurrection. These are the historical basis of the church's preaching, after the resurrection and ascension and the descent of the Spirit. Their significance is the secret of history which will be revealed at the end with the return of Jesus, but which is proclaimed in advance by the church. The events which are the basis for this preaching are evident to all, but only understood by the disciples who witnessed the resurrection and ascension and received the gift of the Spirit. But there is a great responsibility to hear aright what is disclosed in history and kerygma (V. 18.).

The latter warning brings Luke's parable-chapter to a close. He omits all further parables and goes on to emphasize the relationship of the disciples to Jesus, or

rather of those who hear aright Jesus' message and act upon it (VV. 19ff.). This passage has been transposed by Luke from before the parable-chapter to after and now introduces a section which comprises a series of miracles of Jesus - i.e. Mark's section on faith but without the closing pericope of Jesus' rejection at Nazareth.

The collection of miracles in Lk. viii. 22ff represents the deeds of Jesus as the complement to his words in viii. 1-18, 19-21. These are witnessed by the disciples and raise the question of Jesus' identity (V. 25). They lead on directly in Lk. ix to discussion of Jesus' identity and thence to what that involves historically in the passion and resurrection. Here we see the point of the combination here of words and deeds, which are heard and seen by the disciples and form the basis of their kerygma, with the understanding of Jesus' identity which was given to them. That understanding in turn had to be developed to take account of the passion and resurrection, but not abandoned. Jesus is revealed as the Sower of the Word of God and the Saviour of men. This is the point of the account of his preaching and miracles in Luke. The point and purpose of Jesus' life is revealed, however, solely to the disciples, on the basis of their understanding of his identity and of

~~this identity and of~~ the events of the passion, resurrection, and ascension.

The miracles in vii. 22ff. appear simply as miracles. This impression is reinforced by the omission of Mk. vi. 1ff. The miracles in Luke are demonstrations of power (V. 25) and depend on Jesus' unique authority (V. 28), and on the power within him (V. 46). But they are not performed for their own sake (V. 56).

References for Chapter Four

Section (vii)

- ¹cf. Held, op. cit. pp. 170f, 177f., 180f, 192f, 216f, 222, 276, and see the word παραχρήμα at Lk, iv. 39, v. 25, and the reactions of the crowd also the omission in ~~ix~~ 16ff of Jesus' inability to heal.

(viii) Jesus' identity and historical fate, -Lk. ix.

Luke's 'great omission', which includes Mk. vi. 45-viii. 26, results in a drawing together of Herod's question about Jesus' identity (Lk. ix. 6-9, -the account of John's beheading being omitted as well) and Jesus' question to the disciples about the same thing (Lk. ix. 18ff.). Only the account of the feeding of the five thousand separates them (Lk. ix. 10ff.). The Marcan version of the mission of the disciples is found in ix. 1-6, 10a. This shows that the disciples' task is to continue the work of Jesus in word and deed, yet that it must be on the basis of some understanding of Jesus' identity, related to the facts of his life. In Luke Herod is aware that John is dead and that Jesus represents a new challenge (V. 9). This is the point of the mention of John's being beheaded, to differentiate him from Jesus. But the disciples know the correct answer to the question who Jesus is (V. 20). But this is not to be made known because first the disciples must learn what kind of Messiah Jesus is (VV. 21f., cf. iv. 41). Peter's remonstrance about this is omitted by Luke.

Thus Luke's omission of a large part of Mark serves a purpose in the plan of the gospel and involves in the main

duplicate material, apart from two miracles involving magical processes, one miracle performed in Gentile territory, and a dispute on a major theme of Acts. Luke inserts a 'Q' version of the request for a sign later, and keeps the saying about leaven separate. The mention of Bethsaida at ix. 10 may well reflect Luke's knowledge of Mark (cf. Mk. vi. 45, viii. 22) and its secondary character here is shown by its inappropriateness (see V. 12)¹. The passage omitted is important in Mark for the theological construction of the gospel, but its significance was greatly reduced by Matthew.

In Lk. ix. 18ff. the disciples' opinion of Jesus' identity is differentiated from the false views of the crowd and others. A real turning-point in the narrative is reached. But this involves also the fact that the disciples' view is in itself inadequate, and inappropriate before the passion (see the close connection in Luke between the prophecy of the passion and the command to silence, VV. 21f.). As Conzelmann says², 'Luke bases the command of secrecy on the inevitability of the passion, whereas in Mark the secret is a matter of fundamental principle.' 'The disciples must keep Jesus' messiahship secret

till after the passion and resurrection, when, of course, its true nature will be inescapable. The stress on the disciples' complete lack of understanding after the second prediction (V. 45, cf. xviii. 34 and xxiv. 18ff.) shows however that Luke recognizes that the nature of Jesus' messiahship was actually a secret during his lifetime, even if the disciples had ascribed the title to him. But even this is only a historical observation in Luke, and not a fundamental principle. In Mark the point is that Jesus' messiahship was a secret even if the title was conceived of and applied to Jesus. Luke merely asserts that knowledge of the nature of Jesus' messiahship had to await the occurrence of the passion, even though it was explained to the disciples beforehand. There is no suggestion that the very conception of messiahship was inappropriate historically, as in Mark, only that its nature was for a time misconceived. In Luke lack of understanding can also be taken as a historical reason for the secret, coupled with the fact that Jesus had first to fulfil his destiny. In Mark the two motifs, secrecy and lack of understanding, are theologically complementary, but, considered historically, irreconcilable. Luke has rationalized them historically, basing one on the other, so

that they support his picture of the kerygma belonging after Jesus' life, death and resurrection. In Luke this is a historical fact, whereas in Mark it is a theological principle which differentiates between history and the Gospel. For Luke history defines the nature of Jesus' messiahship, whereas for Mark Jesus' messiahship is not deduceable from history at all. For Mark Secrecy stands over against history, whereas for Luke it is part of history. For the Luke the secret of Jesus' messiahship is involved in the historical events themselves. Luke has clarified the Marcan outline historically but simplified the concept behind its structure by historicizing the relation in Mark between history and Gospel into one between the life of Jesus and the kerygma of the church.

The result of this is a narrative centred on Jesus' life seen from the point of view of the kerygma (cf. Lk. xxiv. 19ff., 26f.), and regarded as pre-ordained in a certain form. The special instruction given to the disciples about the passion overshadows their lack of understanding. The crowds will hear later the kerygma of the church through the mouth of the apostles.

In VV. 23ff. Jesus speaks to 'all' about the demands to be made on them and of the fact that the judgment arising

from the coming of the Son of Man, whom the disciples know to be Jesus himself, will be related to one's attitude to the crucified Jesus (V.26). Luke's combination of the sayings about the suffering and glorified Son of Man into one scheme is shown in xvii. 24f. The identity of Jesus with the Son of Man must be presupposed in Mk. viii. 38 too, but there it is also recognized that the Son of Man is primarily a figure of apocalyptic not of history. Luke has identified him with Jesus in both, though he recognizes the novelty of this as regards the passion (xvii. 25). But the passion is, at the same time, the means of identification, by the glorification which follows and Luke has schematized this process. The phase of the passion and Jesus' identity with the Son of Man are what the disciples do not understand in Jesus' lifetime, though they are basic to the post-resurrection kerygma. So deep is their lack of understanding that they do not even protest about it³. But Luke is equally clear that the history of Jesus is the pre-history of the Son of Man as proclaimed in the kerygma. In Luke, the Son of Man is not the judge of the last day, but the intercessor and advocate⁴, the ascended Jesus (Acts vii. 55f.), who is now glorified in his kingdom.

Lk. ix. 27 confirms the view that the kingdom of God is for Luke a supra-historical and supernatural entity which

can now be perceived⁵, just as Jesus and the disciples have already proclaimed it. Perception of it is the same as perception of the Lordship of Jesus (Acts vii. 55f). Jesus the Son of Man proclaims and guarantees the kingdom of God and hence Acts vii. 55f. is for Luke a fulfilment of Lk. ix. 27⁶. The kingdom is not a historical entity but a supernatural fact which is the fulfilment and confirmation of Jesus' words and deeds and of the church's kerygma (Lk. xxii. 15f.). Its guarantee is the death and glorification of Jesus.

The high-point of this section in Luke is the account of the transfiguration in VV. 28ff. This confirms the messiahship of Jesus and also marks the beginning of the road to the passion (V. 31). The passion is in fact the departure of Jesus to heavenly glory (see V. 51). Jesus will instruct his disciples about this (V. 35), though the disciples cannot as yet speak of what they have seen (V. 36)⁷. Luke has no place for Mk. ix. 9ff. since it is enough for him that silence is preserved during Jesus' lifetime. He does not stress the role of John the Baptist as Elijah and prefers to omit the confused passage in Mark ix. 11f., which originally followed Mk. ix. 1. This reflects Luke's total alteration of the scheme of primitive eschatological expectation.

After the healing of the epileptic boy (VV. 37ff.), Luke has the second prediction of the passion and stresses the disciples' total lack of understanding of it (VV. 44f.). This seems to follow more closely the account of the transfiguration and thus to replace Mk. ix. 9ff.⁸ There is then only a remnant of Mk. ix. 33ff. before the note of Jesus' setting out for Jerusalem to be received up (V. 51). The way of the Son of Man is one of sacrifice and allows no resting-place (V. 58). The kingdom of God is of supreme concern.

References for Chapter Four

Section (viii)

¹cf. Conzelmann op. cit. pp. 52ff. on Luke's 'great omission'.

²op. cit. p. 56.

³Conzelmann op. cit. p. 56.

⁴cf. Tödt op. cit. p. 91.

⁵cf. Conzelmann op. cit. pp. 56f., 104f.

⁶see Conzelmann op. cit. p. 115.

cf. also C. K. Barrett 'Stephen and the Son of Man' pp. 32ff. of Apophoreta-Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen. Berlin 1964, where it is said that the appearance to Stephen shows Luke's reinterpretation of eschatology, as a result of the delay in the parousia, in terms of a separate parousia to the individual at death.

⁷see Conzelmann pp. 57ff.

⁸cf. Conzelmann op. cit. p. 60.

(ix) The Journey to Jerusalem and the path to glory, -
Lk. x, xi, xii, xiii, xiv, xv, xvi, xvii, xviii, xix.

Using the Marcan outline and 'Q' and other material, Luke has given special significance to Jesus' journey to Jerusalem. It is firstly Jesus' journey to the passion, but also his journey to heaven (Lk. ix. 51, cf. ix. 31). His way is prepared by disciples who proclaim the presence of the kingdom of God (ix. 1, 9, 11). In Luke it is reaction to the works of the disciples which forms the basis of the judgment (Vv. 13ff., see esp. V. 16, cf. Mtt. xi. 20ff., x. 40). The disciples are the ones to whom the secrets of God are made known (x. 21f., 23f.), and their names are written in heaven (V. 20). Already God's purposes are being fulfilled (V. 18). Here a further theme is asserting itself that through Jesus' life and death and the preaching of the disciples the eschatological fulfilment is under way through history. Actions on earth have an effect in heaven and help forward the kingdom of God. Luke combines interest in the movement of historical events and in the eternal significance of those events. Jesus' progress to Jerusalem and through death to glory is the pattern for history and the plan of God for mankind. This is what the disciples witness and must proclaim as it is the path they themselves must follow. ^(Acts xiv. 22) Mark was only

concerned with the passion as the historical presupposition for the Gospel, as the starting-point from which his gospel was, in effect, constructed backwards and as the dividing-line and connection between history and Gospel. But Luke is concerned with the movement forward to the passion and with the sequence of events which forms the basis of the subsequent kerygma of the church. It is, for Luke, the meaning of the particular historical events of Jesus' life and what it teaches which is specially revealed to the disciples and which comprises the ground for their preaching. Not till these events were fulfilled could the disciples' real preaching about Jesus' messiahship begin, because only then was that messiahship itself fulfilled (Acts ii. 36), i.e. only after the events of Jesus' passion, resurrection and ascension. For Luke history makes its own connection with the kerygma. Luke is not concerned, like Mark, with the historical problem of Jesus' messiahship, but with what history shows us about the nature of his messiahship and how that messiahship was fulfilled in history.

The rest of this section in Luke comprises diverse narrative— and sayings— material which is concerned with the lasting significance of Jesus and his words and works, the basis of the Christian's pilgrimage, dependent as it is on that of Jesus. Luke has provided a setting in the Markan

framework for the sayings - material of 'Q' and other similar material, which shows that it not only originates, at least in part, in the teaching of Jesus but has a place in the life of the church as well, on the basis of what Jesus did and is. The fact that it is the ascending Jesus who calls and sends out disciples in Luke's version (see ix. 51ff., x.1ff.)^{reveals} that this is the point of the following section: that Luke shows that the substance of the church's kerygma is authorized by the ascended Jesus, the Son of Man whom it proclaims.

A pattern of teaching emerges which reveals Luke's interest in the relation between history, i.e. what happened through Jesus as the basis of the Gospel, and the still historical needs of the disciples in the church as they are met by Jesus' teaching. Thus Jesus appears as answering questions about inheriting eternal life (x.25ff cf. Mk. xii. 28ff., and how to pray (xi. 1ff.). An illustration is given of how Jesus has guaranteed the presence of the kingdom (xi. 14ff.). The request for a sign from heaven (V. 16) is answered in terms of the rejected sign of the Son of Man, with his preaching of repentance (VV. 29ff.). The eyes of the beholders had failed in their function and become blinded (VV. 33ff.). This will be the basis of judgement, because their values were wrong (VV. 37ff.). Their behaviour with regard to

Jesus followed a pattern which had been long established (VV. 47ff.). But the disciples must not follow the pattern of the Pharisees (xii. 1), but speak openly of what they know (VV. 2ff.). The future judgment depends on one's present witness to Jesus (VV. 8f.). The really unforgiveable offence is to blaspheme the holy Spirit (V.10), which is the basis of the disciples' witness and inspiration (VV. 11f.). Failure of witness constitutes the blasphemy against the Spirit in Luke, and this is the basis of future condemnation, i.e. denial by the Son of Man, who is Jesus himself (cf. Lk. ix. 26). Confession of Jesus will involve acknowledgment by the Son of Man (Acts vii. 55f., in fulfilment of Lk. ix 27). The mistake is to put one's confidence in transitory things (xii. 13ff. 22ff.), instead of the kingdom of God (VV. 31ff.). It is especially for the disciples to be watchful (VV. 41ff; V. 41 may be a reference to Mk. xiii. 37, cf. Mk. xiii. 34ff., with Lk. xii. 35ff.). The delay in the parousia (see V. 45), or in the arrival of the kingdom, is the ground ~~for~~ concern with the time of the church/^{lying} between Jesus' ascension and parousia, and it results in a totally new approach to the relation between eschatology and history and to the relation between Jesus' life and the period of the church. Jesus' place in the process is referred to in VV. 49f. The effect

of his work is division, based on decision in the present, itself based on discernment of the nature of the time (VV. 51ff., see V. 56). Failure to respond will bring judgment (xiii. 1ff.), and there is a limit to the patience of God (VV. 6ff.).

After an example of the signs of Jesus' historical activity in Israel which is ignored (VV. 10ff.), come two parables about the kingdom of God which emphasize its fulfilment (VV. 18ff.). But many, who may have known Jesus in the flesh, will be excluded (VV. 22ff.). Jesus' authority and the fact that his fate is predetermined are emphasized in VV. 31ff. That is part of his path to perfection. But this does not absolve Jerusalem from guilt and from the effects of its actions (VV. 34f.). But he will return again at the parousia (V. 35). Those called to the feast were unworthy even if they thought otherwise (xiv. 7ff., 12ff., 15ff.). The sabbath on which Jesus worked was the time when he gathered in those who were thought unworthy. But the cost of discipleship must be counted (VV. 25ff.). The repentant sinner is worth more than the 'righteous' (xv. 1ff). The kingdom of God now lies open, but this does not imply free license (xvi. 16ff.). Future reward may involve present deprivation (VV. 19ff.). One's relationship with and attitude to one's fellows are crucial (xvii. 1ff.). Faith achieves

all things (VV. 5f.). But there is no way by which one can earn special privileges (VV. 7ff.). Some would take everything for granted and give nothing in return (VV. 11ff.).

The inserted section of Luke is brought to an end by the problem of the delay in the parousia. The question about the coming of the kingdom is answered by a rebuke of the idea that calculation can decide the time of the coming of the kingdom. The kingdom is always at hand, i.e. always within one's grasp (VV. 20f), however long history endures¹. The time will come when any sight of the Son of Man would be welcome (V.22). But one must never be deceived (V.23). When the Son of Man comes it will be evident to everyone at once (V. 24). But first, within history, he suffers and is rejected (V. 25). The second time his coming will be sudden and unexpected, but unmistakeable (VV. 26ff.). Time may be long and faith sorely tried (xviii. 1ff., see V. 8). Here the context of the church between two appearances of the Son of Man is quite plain, and Luke shows evidence of the fact that he is concerned here to justify the sayings-tradition and its relevance to this time. It depends on the historical life and ministry of Jesus but its importance endures until the parousia, however long the time in between.

This section re-joins Mark in xviii. 15ff. with the

question of what is required to inherit the kingdom of God (VV. 15ff., 18ff., see also VV. 9ff.). The demands made on the disciples are followed by the third prediction of the passion (VV. 31ff.). This last ensures that the whole of the preceding collection is enclosed between two such predictions (see ix. 44) and makes plain that its relevance arises from the passion and resurrection of Jesus, which the disciples only understood later (V.34). Thus its relevance is only perceived after Jesus' passion and resurrection when it is included in the church kerygma. The key to it all lies in the historical passion and resurrection of Jesus. The situation of the disciples now is the same as that of Jesus himself, but he has already guaranteed the fulfilment of their expectations. The relation between present and future, established by Jesus himself, is the point of the whole section just discussed. Within it the relation between history and eschatology has been established on the basis of the historicity of Jesus and the sure expectation of his return. Meanwhile we have the kerygma, based on his life and teaching, and must understand the point of the passion. All that is hidden or not understood will be made plain. When Jesus went to the passion there was a mistaken view that the kingdom of God would immediately appear (xix. 11), but that was shown to be false by the departure of Jesus

(VV. 12ff.). After that the length of time subsequently does not affect the point of the argument which should have been learnt then. The crucifixion of Jesus was the first crisis of the church and it is also the answer to the problem of the delay in the parousia. A period of historical fulfilment must take place first. There is a secret about the kingdom of God which corresponds with the historical secret of Jesus' messiahship, and both are explained by the passion of the Son of Man. It was not valid to expect the kingdom during Jesus' lifetime (vii. 20ff., xix. 11ff.), and the truth is that, for those who want it, it is always at hand. Jesus' healings such as that of the blind man at Jericho (xviii. 35ff.) are expressive of the presence of salvation 'to-day' (xix. 9), salvation which depends on the presence of the Son of Man (V. 10). The work of Jesus guarantees the presence of God's kingdom (xi.20), the intrusion of the realm of God in the world of men, and the fact that God's will prevails over history. But everything depends on men's response (xiii. 26f., xii. 8f.). The kingdom could not appear in Jesus' lifetime because he had to be received up to obtain it (xix. 11ff.), by way of the passion.

The entry into Jerusalem is for Luke that of the king

going to receive his kingdom (xix. 38). But Jerusalem did not recognize the time of visitation (Vv. 41ff.). The historical result of this failure will be destruction. Jesus had to suffer and die (xvii. 25), but this indicates also human failure. History could not contain Jesus' messiahship nor the fulfilment of the kingdom of God. Luke answers both problems together in that history must run its course before either are made plain. Jesus' messiahship is perfected in the kingdom of God, outside and beyond, though by way of, history. Jesus' historicity, for Luke, as well as in different ways for Mark and Matthew, comprises the secret of Jesus' messiahship and the secret of the fulfilment of his eschatological message of salvation, now understood in terms of the Son of Man, who must first suffer and die (xvii. 25,)². From then on he is hidden at the right hand of God (Lk. xxii. 69, Acts vii. 55f) in the kingdom of God, but the point of decision is to be found in the historical Jesus (xii. 8f).

Luke does not recognize the redemptive aspect of the passion of the Son of Man (see his omission of Mk. x. 45, cf. xxii. 27). For Mark, the historical Jesus had soteriological significance over against the conception of the coming Son of Man. But Luke sees soteriological significance throughout history and not just in the passion, except in so far as it guarantees the identity between the historical Jesus and the

Son of Man and is the path to glorification. Luke does not look back to the historical Jesus any more but forward from the time of the church to the future redemption (xxi.28) and the kingdom of God, still in the future (xxi. 31) for human history. The past is only the presupposition for the future, whereas for Mark the historical Jesus is the content of the future hope. For Luke history is only the beginning, for Mark it is the basic point of reference (Mk. i. 1). This is so even though Mark takes even more seriously than Luke the continuing secret of Jesus' identity and the inadequacy of history without faith in the resurrection. For Luke history has a quality of its own resulting from the presence of the Son of Man; it is not just the quantitative point of reference that it is for Mark. For Mark the historical Jesus is understood only on the basis of the post-resurrection Gospel, whilst for Luke he has a status of his own, within history as well as at the end, though discerned through the kerygma. In Mark the Son of Man is a conception which can be related to Jesus by way of the passion and resurrection, whilst for Luke the passion and resurrection of Jesus is seen as the way of the Son of Man to glory. But whilst for Mark the historical Jesus remains the point of reference, even in

the future expectation of the Son of Man (Mk. viii. 38), for Luke he is the point of decision because he has moved on to glory. Luke takes seriously the presence of Jesus now at the right hand of God. Faith is to be placed now in Jesus as the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of God (as in the creed), rather than in the historical Jesus. In Mark redemption consists in a faith-relationship with Jesus on the basis of the passion and resurrection; in Luke it lies in the future with Jesus' return. For Mark the secret of Jesus' messiahship is complete enclosing within it the mystery of eschatological fulfilment; for Luke it merely arises from the past circumstances of his life and death, just as they constituted the delay in the coming of the kingdom of God, which must now be differently understood. The secret of Jesus' messiahship is for Luke the secret of his passion, as constituting an apparent delay in the coming of the kingdom of God. This, together with the delay in the parousia of the Son of Man, is for Luke all part of God's plan of redemption, which is revealed by the Gospel; for Mark the problem of eschatological fulfilment is the mystery of each moment, demanding faith in Jesus as the Christ, as the essence of one's watching.

References for Chapter Four

Section (ix)

¹cf. Conzelmann op. cit. pp. 120ff. This is the essence of Luke's reinterpretation of primitive Christian eschatology.

²cf. Tödt op. cit. pp. 97ff., 101ff.

- (x) Past, present and future; the historical fate of Jesus set in relation to the future fulfilment ~~the purposes of~~ of God, - Lk. xx, xxi, xxii, xxiii.

Jesus' arrival in Jerusalem represented for Luke the ultimate challenge in history to the Jewish people (cf. xix. 41ff., xx. 9ff. as the answer to the question of xx. 1ff. about Jesus' authority, see especially xx. 9b, 10a, 16). The crucial nature of the historical events with regard to judgment, itself carried out in history, is the point here. God's purposes are, however, carried out even by means of the guilt of men. There is a tension in history between men's actions and God's designs, and this continues after the passion. The time of proclamation was needed to declare to men the purposes of God; thus Luke had to add a second volume. The history recorded in the first volume takes its meaning from the kerygma proclaimed in the second, though that kerygma depends on the events recorded in the first.

Luke has to deal with the other interpretations of history of the Jewish or Roman authorities and the one of the disciples contemporary with the events themselves. These are the things which concern Luke. He is concerned with the Jewish view that Jesus was an imposter and the Roman that he was a political leader, as well as the original one of the disciples that he was the one who

should have redeemed Israel (xxiv. 21). The secret of his life was that he was none of these things, though he was the Messiah in a quite different sense (see the so-called political apologetic in Luke¹, which is part of Luke's justification of the life of Jesus in relation to world-history and the fulfilment of God's purposes, which are demonstrated as non-political by Jesus' crucifixion, rather than the reverse). Jesus' death was part of God's purposes and not the fault of the world powers, whose ignorance is dispersed by the kerygma and with whom there was no real clash, but it was also a by-product of Jewish failure to accept and recognize the day of visitation. But Luke does not appear to think that it could have been otherwise. God is the Lord of history and himself in control. Mark was content to see the passion as the supreme historical negation or secret of Jesus' messiahship viewed in historical terms, but Luke has to try to see meaning in the history itself, so that the passion becomes itself the secret of Jesus' messiahship in that Jesus is shown by it as not the expected political Messiah, and innocent in the eyes of the authorities.

The three Marcan disputes reproduced by Luke in xx. 20ff. fit with Luke's view-point. The first is explicitly intended to cause political trouble for Jesus (xx. 20), which fails

(V.26). The question about the resurrection has an interest for Jesus' own resurrection and the nature of the resurrection life, and the final one, asked by Jesus himself, emphasizes the transcendent character of the Messiah, against other views.

In the Marcan apocalypse, Lk. xxi. 5ff., Luke relates the situation both to future history and the parousia. He is concerned firstly with historical events, i.e. the destruction of Jerusalem, as distinct from eschatological events (VV. 8f., 20-24), and then with the parousia of the Son of Man as the sign of the nearness of the kingdom of God (VV. 25ff., 31). But these two are separate and in no way related to each other. History and eschatology are two different spheres. One must be always ready for the end, since the necessary historical events have taken place, but there is no fixed time when the end will occur. This is the point of the Lucan ending of the discourse in VV. 34ff. These verses should be taken in conjunction with xviii. 1-8. All that is known with certainty is that the end brings redemption (VV. 25-28). The only precise information in this passage is that about the destruction of the temple - which has taken place. But there is no connection between that event and eschatology. The only thing that can be said is that the end follows a long period

of history. Endurance seems to be required rather than watching (VV. 34ff.).² Eschatology has become a problem of history rather than vice-versa.³

VV. 37f. which follow remind us of Jesus' teaching in the temple. The passion drama begins (xxii) as a preface to Jesus' resurrection and ascension. The hour had come (xxii. 14). Satan returns to the fight (V. 3)⁴. The supper is a prelude to the passion (V. 15) and opens up a period of waiting and suspension (VV. 16, 18). The fact that a period elapses before the kingdom appears is more prominent in Luke. The church must hereafter take over the role of Jesus (VV. 24ff.), and will eventually share his kingdom (VV. 29f.). But a new period will first emerge when the church must be ready (VV. 35ff.). History and eschatology are firmly differentiated. The prayer of Jesus in Gethsemane is definitely related in Luke to the coming passion. The things concerning Jesus are nearing their end (V. 37), but the end is not yet (xxi. 9). There is a period under the power of darkness (V. 53). There was no possibility that Jesus' messiahship would be accepted then (VV. 67f.), but from henceforth the Son of Man is at the right hand of the power of God (V. 69). The Jews rightly see this as a claim to be the Son of God (V. 70).⁵

Conzelmann is right⁶ that here is the basic delineation of Luke's christology, but the titles are differentiated functionally and interpreted in accordance with Luke's understanding of history, although they are equally applicable to Jesus⁷. Luke is aware that a supposed claim to be the Messiah was the cause of Jesus' condemnation, and reflects that here, but he does not take it seriously. He attributes the suggestion to the Jews themselves (V. 70, cf. xxiii. 35). But yet the passion was the necessary means by which Jesus accomplished his messiahship and its necessity a reason why Jesus refused to speak of his messiahship before. This must be explained later in the kerygma, when the Son of Man is sitting on the right hand of God. The chief priests are not permitted to see this (contrast Mk. xiv. 62 and Mtt. xxvi. 64)⁸. The vision of the session on high is reserved for the martyrs at death as a foretaste of the end and the sight of the parousia will be seen by the Christians as a sign of the approach of their redemption. If Jesus was the Messiah he was certainly not the kind of Messiah the Jews said that he claimed to be (see xxiii. 4, 14f., 22, cf. VV. 2f. 47). The irony of it is that in crucifixion Jesus did become the Messiah (Acts ii. 36). This is for Luke the historical secret of

his messiahship, and it is what the kerygma declares to the nations in their ignorance⁹ (cf. xxiii. 34). Jesus entered into his kingdom by way of the passion (VV. 42f.).

References for Chapter Four

Section (x)

- ¹cf. Conzelmann op. cit. pp. 137ff.
- ²cf. Todt op. cit. pp. 89ff., Conzelmann pp. 125ff., 132ff.
- ³Käsemann Exegetische Versuche I p. 199 (Das Problem des historischen Jesus'), Essays p. 29.
- ⁴cf. Conzelmann op. cit. pp. 80, 199.
- ⁵cf. Todt op. cit. p. 96.
- ⁶op. cit. p. 70.
- ⁷Todt op. cit. pp. 96f.
- ⁸Todt op. cit. pp. 94ff.
- ⁹Conzelmann op. cit. pp. 83-93, esp. 89f.,

(xi) The resurrection and the explanation of the passion,- xxiv.

With the resurrection Luke explains the meaning of Jesus' life and death as preceding the proclamation of the church and as a stage in the process towards redemption. The women at the tomb encounter two angels who remind them of what Jesus said in Galilee about the necessary fate of the Son of Man (xxiv. 6f.). Here Luke has altered Mk. xvi 7 in order to follow the tradition of Jerusalem appearances and to introduce the elucidation of the sayings about the passion of the Son of Man which the disciples did not, and could not, understand during Jesus' lifetime. V. 7 is a free rendering of Mk. viii. 31 (=Lk. ix. 22, note the secondary *σταυρωθῆναι*, cf. Matt. xxvi. 2)¹. Here Luke gives the point of Jesus' life, which was concealed during his lifetime, at the culmination of his 'life of Jesus'. On the basis of this understanding, vouchsafed to the disciples at the resurrection, the apostles proclaim the kerygma, and on the basis of that kerygma Luke wrote his life-story of Jesus. Jesus the Messiah and Son of Man first ministered in Galilee, then died, and entered into his glory (V. 26). This was a necessary preliminary to the coming redemption

(see V. 21a). From then on proclamation is made, beginning from Jerusalem (VV. 46ff.). The proclamation is made on the basis of sure encounter with the risen Christ (VV. 11, 36ff.). The reality and historicity of the resurrection itself is stressed, so that there can be no doubt that the risen Christ is Jesus himself (VV. 39, 41ff.). But it is this encounter rather than the empty tomb which is the basis of faith. The reality of the risen Jesus rather than of the empty tomb is the point. Jesus leaves the stage of history for the realm of heaven, and his kingdom (V. 41 see Acts 1.9). The kingdom of God still lies in the future, but it is a present reality only to be fully realized in the future (Acts 1.3, 6f.). The resurrection is for Luke a necessary historical dividing-line between the life of Jesus and the kerygma of the church, whilst for Mark it marks the point where the Gospel comes fully into being on the basis of faith in Jesus as Lord and Christ beyond the bounds of history. Luke has here historicized the conception of Mark.

Luke has historicized Mark's approach to the historical Jesus in the sense that, whereas for Mark the historical Jesus is the subject of the Gospel and the Messiah on the basis of faith in the resurrection and not

on the basis of history, for Luke the disciples are able to proclaim the nature of Jesus' messiahship and the significance of his life only after the resurrection. But Luke, and not Mark, writes a life of Jesus on the basis of that proclamation ^{to show} ~~For Mark the problem of~~ the historical presupposition for that proclamation. For Mark the problem of the historical Jesus remains and his messiahship is still a secret. His gospel is an account of how Jesus is validly conceived and known as the Messiah only after the resurrection, because that was when the Gospel appeared, even though Jesus' historicity is its presupposition. The latter fact is the sole justification for his gospel. The life of Jesus remains a mystery and an offence apart from that Gospel. For Mark too the kingdom of God is a mystery only known by insight into Jesus' identity, whilst for Luke it is something to be realized at the end of history at the parousia of the Son of Man, and its realization depends on certain historical events taking place first, including the life, death, resurrection and ascension of Jesus. Meanwhile he is at the right hand of God, beckoning his martyrs to his side. Luke has used Mark and reinterpreted him in terms of a particular view of history, but he can be seen to be dealing with the same 'data' and the same

fundamental situation. Each of the synoptic gospels makes its own contribution to the question of the historical Jesus and his relationship to the Gospel and the church and takes that question into account on the basis of Mark's conception of the messianic secret, though its detailed interpretation is different in each case. That conception is fundamental to the construction of the synoptic gospels and stands for a fundamental aspect of the structure of the Gospel itself as represented by the kerygmatic tradition, however the conception is expounded in each case. This is the lesson of the present piece of work.

References for Chapter Four

Section (xi)

¹Tødt op. cit. p. 141.

Chapter Five. Conclusions.

The messianic secret in Mark was held by Wrede and Bultmann to be a literary device which attempted to reconcile unmessianic tradition, stemming from the unmessianic character of Jesus' life, and messianic material, formulated by the church on the basis of its post-resurrection faith in Jesus as Messiah. Burkill virtually repeats this view-point of the implications and presuppositions of the secrecy-theme, except that, for him, the secret is also a positive attempt by Mark at a theological interpretation of the hidden meaning of Jesus' life and death as those of the Messiah. Others, notably Sjöberg, have asserted that the secrecy-theme is basic to the synoptic tradition as a whole and has its roots in Jesus' own conception of the nature of his messiahship in terms of the Son of Man, first concealed, but later to be revealed. Some have seen it as an apologetic device to reconcile history with the Gospel (so Bousset), others as a denial of the independent importance of history and a means of emphasizing the kerygma and faith (so H. J. Ebeling), and yet others as reflecting the basic theological structure of the history itself (so Schniewind and Cranfield). Another view, propounded first by Conzelmann, is that it is the creation of the evangelist Mark, reflecting a basic

theological principle, enunciating the relation between history and the Gospel in assessing the significance of Jesus' person, as required by the form and content of the gospel. This latter approach, which is a refinement of that of Wrede and Bultmann, is the one that has been developed in the preceding chapters.

This development has been based on the following points: (1) that the theme of secrecy by Mark stands over against messianic, not unmessianic, material and that it negates an earthly or historical messiahship whilst insisting on a heavenly messiahship in terms of Jesus as the Son of Man who had first to suffer and die on earth; (2) that the bi-polarity of concealment and revelation in Mark does not reflect an ambiguous account of Jesus' life, but an ambiguous attitude to the historical Jesus, depending on whether he is seen in historical terms as his contemporaries saw him or in terms of the Gospel as it came into being after the resurrection, so that there is presented a dialectical relationship between history, as the presupposition for the Gospel, and the Gospel itself after the resurrection, the gospel of Mark itself being an account of the historical origin and presupposition for the post-resurrection Gospel; (3) that the secrecy-theme in

Mark is a redactional addition of the evangelist's, consisting of two parts, one that Jesus' messiahship had to be kept a secret till after the resurrection, and the other that the disciples did not understand it until after the resurrection, and that this combination shows the theme to be a dogmatic device which separates history and the Gospel whilst establishing a relation between them based on the person of Jesus the Messiah and Son of Man, on the basis of the historical fact that the Gospel arose from the resurrection, whether the disciples thought Jesus to have been the Messiah during his lifetime or not; (4) that the Son of Man title represents a christological development of the early church which explains the nature of Jesus' messiahship, after the resurrection, and is itself reinterpreted to take account of the passion, death and resurrection of Jesus by which it was possible for Jesus to be identified with the Son of Man; (5) that the different Son of Man sayings reflect different stages in this development in the pre-Markan tradition, which have been brought together to interpret the relation between the historical Jesus and the Messiah of the Gospel and to give meaning to the account before us, but in no way represent a single picture originating in the preaching of Jesus himself of Jesus as the Son of Man, first concealed on

earth and later to be revealed from heaven; (6) that the Son of Man sayings can only be taken together as references to Jesus himself in the context of the Gospel and the kerygmatic tradition, and that some of them at least are creations of the tradition; (7) that if some of the Son of Man sayings are authentic they cannot all be, and that, if authentic, they had not the same meaning and significance on the lips of Jesus that they have in the gospel or the tradition; (8) that the combination of Son of Man sayings and secrecy elements in Mark is the interpretative work of the evangelist which Matthew and Luke felt free to alter, supplement, or omit; (9) that each evangelist has difficulties with the historical aspects of Jesus' messiahship and makes use of the theme of secrecy as an interpretative device in accordance with his own view of the relation between history and the Gospel; (10) that there is no independent relation between the theme of secrecy and the Son of Man title which could reflect the original attitude of Jesus himself; (11) that the secrecy theme is in no gospel a mere attempt at historical apologetic but recognizes some distinction between history and the Gospel, yet, at the same time, that each attempt attributes some value to history at least in so far as the historical Jesus is concerned;

(12) that the secrecy-theme is a secondary interpretative device of Mark's which the other evangelists have made use of, but also seeks to show the positive relation between history and the Gospel, whilst showing consciousness of historical difficulties; (13) that the theme is not basic to the tradition and is only seen as fundamental to the history itself on the basis of the post-resurrection Gospel; (14) that each evangelist witnesses in some way to the validity of the Marcan theme in an attempt to present the kerygmatic tradition in the form of a life of Jesus and to show how that tradition can have the historical Jesus as its content; (15) that the secrecy-theme is a necessity of any use of the kerygmatic tradition in the form of a life of Jesus, though Matthew and Luke have modified its significance and reinterpreted it; that the secret is implicit in the kerygma in its post-resurrection preaching of Jesus, but is so because acceptance of the kerygma depends on faith, just as its preaching depends on divine revelation.

Each gospel is, in both form and content, an account of the historical Jesus, but that is not the sole purpose of the evangelist in writing. Their interest in the historical Jesus centres on his relation to the Gospel, or to the church, or to the 'kerygma'. This interest governs the presentation by each of the synoptic evangelists of the

kerygmatic tradition. Mark, aware of the difficulties, did not need an 'apologia' for history, but he did need an 'apologia' for writing his gospel, and an explanation of his purpose. Nowhere does he appeal to history in defence of the Gospel, but, rather, he presents history as the presupposition of the Gospel (i. 1), which the Gospel had to explain. The explanation was in terms of Jesus as the Son of Man, who first had to suffer, die, and rise again. During his lifetime there was secrecy, concealment, and lack of understanding, even though this was only for a time and the disciples would understand later. This fact is of fundamental importance for the continuing relationship between history and the Gospel in determining the identity of the historical Jesus. The historical Jesus is the subject of the Gospel but this fact depends on the resurrection and faith, and only on his life as something completed. Nowhere is historical revelation of Jesus as the Messiah or Son of God stressed by Mark, and although he is designated as both he is so designated in a way which depends on the passion and resurrection, and on his identification with the coming Son of Man. All acclaim of him as Messiah there and then is silenced and the validity of historical messiahship questioned (xii. 35ff.).

It is dismissed as irrelevant since the emphasis is on the future coming of the Son of Man (xiv. 62). But at the same time it is possible, in the context of the passion, for Jesus to affirm the messianic title, though he still does so with eyes fixed on the future. If Jesus is claimed to be Messiah in history this is only as the crucified Son of Man (viii. 31). The disciples' vision of him as Son of God (ix. 2ff.) is followed by instruction that he can only be proclaimed as the Son of Man, crucified and raised from the dead. Mark has used kerygmatic material and texts such as Dan. vii. 13, Ps. cx. 1, and Ps. cxviii. 2f. to show how their relevance to Jesus depends on the resurrection, and that their context is the preaching of the Gospel after the resurrection. But their being used of Jesus at all depends on his life and death, and his resurrection from the dead. The resurrection provides continuity between Jesus and the Gospel and illustrates discontinuity between the Gospel and his earthly life. Even the disciples' belief in his messiahship, which appeared to have been belied by events, is shown as being both true and false, but only valid after the passion and resurrection (viii. 27ff.). Jesus had probably denied it, perhaps with his eyes on a coming Son of Man, certainly with his eyes on the kingdom of God, but it is affirmed

afresh from the resurrection in new terms. There is a relation between the crucified Jesus and the Son of Man, which depends ultimately on their identification, an identification dependent on the passion (viii. 38), but they are still differentiated historically, despite viii. 31. The so-called predictions of the passion (viii. 31, ix. 31, x. 33f.) are 'ex eventu' kerygmatic pronouncements about the Son of Man dependent on his identification with Jesus. They are used to stress the centrality to Mark's account of the passion and resurrection of Jesus, as the basic presupposition of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, ^{which} from ~~the~~ events the whole book has been written backwards. They are the basic explanation of the relation between the Gospel and the historical Jesus and are presented as not understood in Jesus' lifetime because of false messianic beliefs. But Jesus' messiahship can itself only be understood on the basis of the passion and resurrection.

Basic to the construction of Mark's gospel was the passion narrative. The rest of the narrative material has been arranged to lead up to that and follows the same pattern. The passion is the historical basis for taking the secret as the explanation of the relation between history and the Gospel, and for its place in the Marcan

narrative. The passion was historically contradictory of belief in Jesus' messiahship and of Jesus' expectation of the kingdom of God, but yet the historical contradiction of both of these was explained by the Gospel on the basis of the passion and resurrection themselves and both Jesus' messiahship and his eschatological expectation were understood afresh in christological terms with the use of the Son of Man expectation (though that expectation was itself reinterpreted in the process). The theme of the messianic secret in Mark reflects the fundamental structure of the relationship between history and the Gospel in determining the identity of Jesus, and was necessary in an account of the historical Jesus which was intended to be a description of the historical basis of or presupposition for the Gospel (i.1).

It should never be forgotten that Mark's account of the historical Jesus in the form of a life-story, using the kerygmatic tradition and the passion narrative, seems to have been quite novel. The attempt involved taking material out of its 'Sitz-im-Leben' in the preaching of the church and relating it to the 'Sitz-im-Leben Jesu'. This brought out the implicit structure of the church's preaching of Jesus in a tradition which also presupposed his own life and preaching. The resulting setting of the material in the gospel had to take into account each 'Sitz-im-Leben' and

the relation between them¹. A distinction between them there certainly was and Mark was not concerned to piece together from the tradition a historical account of Jesus' ministry. He was not concerned with the outline of Jesus' life, but with its outcome. Wrede was right that the distinction demanded a literary device to allow for it - though he had not adequately differentiated Mark from previous tradition, but ~~that~~ the device was not intended to cover up that distinction. In fact Mark emphasizes the distinction in order to show that only the Gospel could proclaim the truth about Jesus' person, on the basis of the resurrection-faith. Mark was concerned to show the precise relation between the Gospel and the historical Jesus, and he did so by means of the theme of the messianic secret. The unifying christological description of Jesus is that of the Son of Man, who now appears historically in Jesus of Nazareth and suffers, dies, and rises from the dead.

On the basis of Mark's bare account of the relation between history and Gospel, the other two evangelists who use Mark's framework developed his scheme, Matthew theologizing it and Luke historicizing it. Both give greater stress to the inner meaning of the history itself, but both retain the specifically messianic secret in some sense even though

alterations are made in the context as a whole (see Mtt. xvi. 20, Lk. ix. 21). Neither objected to the scheme of Mark, in which Jesus neither made nor allowed direct and unambiguous statements of his identity - even though they both made use of the 'Q' Son of Man sayings to refer directly to the earthly Jesus, since these are used in contexts of offence or concealment - but they have reinterpreted that scheme and for that reason altered or rearranged the Marcan secrecy motifs. What they have reinterpreted, in a way that demanded alteration of the secrecy-theme, is precisely the Marcan presentation of the relation between history and the Gospel. Matthew expounds the historical concealment and the revelation to the church of Jesus' messiahship as the beginning of the Gospel, and Luke the relation in history between the life of Jesus and the 'kerygma' in the time of the church. Mark's theme of secrecy had to be adapted to these different interpretations and presentations of the history at the heart of the Gospel.

Matthew adopts a historicizing style, creating a smoother, more compact narrative out of Mark, and historicizes several Marcan motifs (e.g. Mtt. xii. 14-16, xiii. 10-13, 58). But he does so, not to stress history as such, but for a theological purpose. He emphasizes the historical Jesus as the one

who does not advertise himself (xii. 18ff.), because perception of his identity depends on the revelation of God (xvi. 13-20). Reception of revelation depends on the recipient (xii. 22ff., 38ff.), and the most important thing is to have faith. Matthew emphasizes the life of Jesus, but does not write a biographical account as such. Matthew is aware of the historical difficulties of ascribing messiahship to Jesus, both in his ministry and subsequently. For Matthew two ways of viewing history are possible, one which recognizes it as 'Heilsgeschichte', i.e. history which has its place in the plan of salvation, and one which fails so to recognize it. For Matthew, Jesus was the Messiah, but as far as the Jews are concerned he was the rejected Messiah. Perception of his messiahship depended on divine revelation granted to faith (xvi. 17ff., ix. 27ff.). Because of this Jesus' messiahship was not perceived, and was concealed. This was despite the fact that he was the Son of David and despite the evidence of his words and works. The disciples came to understand who Jesus was during his lifetime, though like members of the church even they did not always have sufficient faith. The life of Jesus, from first to last, is for Matthew the story of the rejection of the Messiah, the son of David, the king of the Jews (i, ii, xxvi, xxvii), who proclaimed in word and deed the presence of God

(i.23) and the working of his kingdom (xi. 12, xii.28). The latter eschatological aspect is for Matthew dependent on Jesus' identity, both then and in the future, with the Son of Man, the judge of the world. But in the first instance he goes unseen, later he will be revealed in judgment, exercised on the basis of response to him and service to his brethren.

The issues of Mark are presented by Matthew in terms of Jesus' earthly life, though they are so presented on the basis of the preaching of the church. For Matthew, the church rather than the Gospel is what lies between the life of Jesus and the parousia. The Son of Man appears both before and after, as the founder of the church on the basis of confession of Jesus' messiahship, and as the coming judge who will exercise judgment in accordance with recognition of and response to Jesus' messiahship. The messianic secret is the revelation granted to the church, i.e., during Jesus' lifetime, to his disciples. The disciples are therefore represented as having understanding but lacking faith; whereas, in Mark, the disciples are deficient in understanding during Jesus' life, and faith is the quality which is crucial for understanding of Jesus' identity. But Mark is concerned with the relation between the historical Jesus and the Gospel, whilst Matthew is concerned with the question from within

Jesus' life, and with the historical presuppositions for the church's message of salvation. Matthew is concerned with the relation between the historical Jesus and the church, and with the truth inherent in that relationship in history. The reverse side of the picture is therefore Jesus' treatment in history by the Jews, and this constitutes in retrospect the messianic secret, in that the Messiah was put to death and rejected. But even this is shown to fit the pattern of history as it continues until the parousia. The prophets were rejected ever and the kingdom of God is at present open to assault, but in the end God's purposes will prevail. The earthly Jesus was the Son of Man who sowed the good seed, and inevitably the enemy sowed tares. Till the end of time there will be this division among men, and at the end the Son of Man will return to separate good from bad. Meanwhile the church is a witness to this process and to the work of the Son of Man, and even within history the signs of God's purposes can be discerned. Responsibility for discerning them rests, however, with the observers (xiii. 13, xii. 38ff., xxvii. 25) now as well as then.

Matthew does not and cannot put final emphasis on Jesus' life, in messianic terms. He does not write a messianic life of Jesus, but illustrates from Jesus' life the nature of

historical decision about Jesus. The decision must be one which discerns in Jesus' life, death, and resurrection the saving purposes of God. These will only be fulfilled in the future. Nor does Matthew emphasise the purely historical aspect of Jesus' messiahship. That is secondary to revelation and faith. It is not enough to know that Jesus was the son of David, since Matthew knows that more is involved in messiahship than that (xxii. 41ff.). Faith requires acceptance of Jesus as David's Lord, indeed as the Son of Man. Matthew's emphasis on the revelation to the disciples (xvi. 13ff.) only serves to emphasize the theme of the historical concealment of Jesus' messiahship during his lifetime. It reinforces Mark whilst supporting Matthew's particular explanation of the secret as the result of lack of faith, blindness, and obstinacy on the part of the rest, and as belonging to the time of the first appearance of the Son of Man in obscurity before the final and universal revelation in apocalyptic events. It also supports Matthew's view of the church as the sole witness to revelation and the medium of salvation through faith in Jesus, as well as the guarantee of his continued presence and present Lordship as it continues his work of helping forward the rule of God.

Luke's explanation of the secret is in historical terms with an emphasis on the necessity of the passion, which the disciples did not understand. Luke stresses the bare historicity of Jesus the Messiah, the nature of whose messiahship is historically disclosed to an unseeing world. Human history must run to its close before the timeless realm of God and the redemption brought by the Son of Man can be revealed (xvii. 20ff., xix. 11ff. xxi. 28). That Son of Man must also first suffer and die on earth (xvii. 25), and must do so before the kerygma can be proclaimed (ix. 21f.). The secrecy is not a fundamental principal but a temporary state. It existed during Jesus' lifetime for all, including the disciples (xxiii. 34, xxiv. 17ff., 44ff.), and afterwards for those who have not heard or will not accept the kerygma. The secrecy in Luke is concerned with the nature of Jesus' messiahship in history. This is a historical use of the association in Mark between the command to secrecy about Jesus' messiahship and the 'prophecies' about the passion of the Son of Man (see xxiv. 6f.) which were not understood. It results in a historical secret about Jesus' messiahship and a historicization of the relationship in Mark between history and the Gospel into the relationship between the life of Jesus and the kerygma of the church. Luke stresses the history that is the basis of the kerygma, but

does so without denying that the kerygma was needed to explain the history. The kerygma, however, could not come into being before certain historical events took place, i.e. the passion and resurrection of Jesus, the Son of Man. For Luke he is now on the right hand of God (xxii. 69) and waits till his return (Acts vii. 55f.). Certain things must happen yet in history (xxi.24), but Jesus has already received his kingdom (xix. 12, 15, xxii. 28ff.) although its completion must wait. Meanwhile the apostles proclaim the kerygma. This latter fact is accounted for in Luke's second volume. The fact that he required a second volume shows his historicization of the relationship between history - for him the Life of Jesus - and Gospel, as it is presented in Mark. This presentation is, however, not only secondary to Mark, but secondary to the kerygma itself as a post-resurrection phenomenon, and it declares the fact that it is secondary to the kerygma (i. 1-4). Luke reflects understanding of Jesus' messiahship in terms of the Son of Man who first suffered, died, and rose again in history, and an understanding of the Son of Man, who is identified with the Jesus as the subject of the kerygma and the future hope of the church. It is plain that this understanding was based on the resurrection, although it is explained in terms of a previous

lack of understanding of the nature of Jesus' messiahship, which is given as a reason why Jesus' messiahship was in fact a secret during his lifetime, even though the disciples thought of the title and applied it to Jesus.

This secondary attempt to understand the secrecy in historical terms supports Mark's account of it as a basic principle that Jesus' messiahship could not be proclaimed or understood during Jesus' lifetime or on the basis of his life alone, reflecting the fact that it was not understood during his life. It does not support the view that the secrecy-theme arises out of a secret kept to avoid misunderstanding, but rather the fact of misunderstanding and the inevitability of misunderstanding in historical terms, in short the fact that Jesus' messiahship was not understood and was concealed during his lifetime. This fact is the basis for the theme in the synoptic gospels, and its justification, and it shows that it was recognized by the early church that the basis of the Gospel and of faith in Jesus is the resurrection. Mark's expression of this has been used by Matthew and Luke, and his account of the relation between history and the Gospel, systematized, both theologically and historically, in relation to the life of Jesus itself. But the correctness of the Marcan principle as the basis for the creation of the kind of

literature we call 'gospels' is not questioned by either Matthew or Luke. What they do is try to explain the secrecy-theme itself in their accounts of Jesus, either as a factor in Jesus' historicity which shows the necessity for divine revelation and for faith mediated by the church, or as a necessary aspect of Jesus' life, and of his messiahship². They have developed the literary form created by Mark and have used it to express more than Mark intended, but in doing so they have weakened his juxtaposing of history and Gospel. Their different presuppositions about the nature of what they were writing save them from allowing their different purposes to lead them into contradicting Mark. These purposes are what governed their treatment of Mark's theme of secrecy and demanded the alterations made, but they treat the theme for what it is, a hermeneutical device which is the key to what they wrote. Matthew's historicizing style and his desire to emphasize revelation and faith compelled him to alter suggestions of an intended secrecy, and Luke's emphasis on history made it necessary to say that the secrecy was only necessary for a time so that God's purposes in the passion and resurrection might be fulfilled. But neither Matthew nor Luke suggest that the life of Jesus was messianic in a normal sense. Both

suggest in different ways that history was the opposite of revelation, indeed that it involved concealment of Jesus' identity, though Matthew understands this theologically in terms of the nature of revelation and Luke historically, in terms of the nature of Jesus' historical vocation. In both gospels concealment is fundamental and does not appear as a mere historical method of practice on Jesus' part to avoid misunderstanding. Even in Luke it is suggested that there was total lack of understanding, even on the part of the disciples, and that this was fundamental to the history itself, and could not be dispelled even by clear instruction. According to Luke the disciples were prevented from understanding (ix. 45, xviii. 34). In Matthew revelation is granted only to the church, as its foundation. This shows that both Matthew and Luke were aware that they were interpreting a fundamental principle in the Marcan narrative, even though in interpreting it they altered its character. Yet, however interpreted, the mystery remains. The schemes of Matthew and Luke are attempts to elucidate it.

The theme of secrecy, which Matthew and Luke have taken from Mark, is the key to the interpretation of each gospel, and by means of this key the gospels explain how we are to regard the history which is prior to the Gospel.

It is necessary to the writing of a gospel at all, as well as a device which explains the function of a gospel. Because of this the section of each gospel which corresponds with Mk. viii. 27ff., ix. 1ff. is central to the whole work. This section also shows what the status of history is for each evangelist, History is either the presupposition for the Gospel, which neither anticipates it nor renders it unnecessary (Mark), or the sphere of secret revelation to the church (Matthew), or a necessary part of the purposes of God which is at first not understood (Luke). The secret is relevant to Jesus' life either as basic principle, or as a factor in his historicity, or as a temporary, though necessary, part of his vocation. The Gospel is the means by which history can be understood, the concealed witness of history itself, or the proclamation of the purpose of history. Its basis is christological, and found in the historical Jesus. Matthew explains it as present in Jesus' lifetime behind the events themselves, whilst Luke sees it guaranteed by Jesus' life though only known and proclaimed later. Mark thinks of a dialectical relation between history and Gospel involved in faith in Jesus. An illustration of these approaches is found in the different interpretations of eschatology in each gospel. In Mark Jesus' preaching of the kingdom of God is the

mystery of his identity (Mk. i. 1, 14f.); in Matthew the working of the kingdom of heaven is the concealed reality behind history (Mtt. xi. 12), guaranteed and set in motion by the presence in history of the Son of Man (Mtt. xiii. 36ff.); in Luke the kingdom of God is witnessed to by history as its culmination, brought within men's reach in the preaching of Jesus (Lk. xvi. 16, xvii. 21) and to be brought at his return as the fulfilment of the promise of his life (Lk. xix. 11ff., xxi. 31). In Mark the apocalyptic Son of Man is set in relation to Jesus, though their identity remains a paradox (Mk. viii. 31, 38); in Matthew Jesus is the Son of Man both within history and at the end (Mtt. xiii. 36ff. cf. Mtt. xvi. 13, 21, 27f., x. 32f.); in Luke Jesus and the Son of Man are simply identified in that Jesus, as proclaimed by the kerygma is the Son of Man who first had to die (Lk. xvii. 25), now sits at the right hand of God (Lk. xxii. 69, Acts vii. 55f.), and will come again (Lk. xvii. xvii. 24, Acts i. 11). For Mark the identification of the Son of Man with Jesus is the basis for condemnation (Mk. viii. 38) or redemption (Mk. x. 45) because of the passion; for Matthew the passion is the ultimate basis of condemnation for unbelief, and a challenge to the belief of the disciples; in Luke it is a necessary

part of history prior to the redemption at the end of history brought by Jesus (Lk. xxi. 28, xviii. 1-8). In Mark the disciples did not understand until the Gospel, based on faith in the resurrection, was given; in Matthew they receive special revelation; in Luke they could not understand until a certain stage in history had been reached.

Each evangelist has fitted traditional material, formed by the preaching of the church, into his narrative on the basis of his understanding of the structure of the Gospel and the status of history within it. Mark has used little sayings material and only done so for a christological purpose; Matthew has revealed church teaching as the implication of Jesus' words and deeds; and Luke has shown how the kerygma depends on Jesus' life and looks forward to the next stage at the parousia (see his long travel section). Together they reveal that the Gospel is based on the resurrection-faith of disciples who had been with Jesus earlier and now had a new relationship with him and his teaching, though one which opened their eyes to the point of the old relationship. The gospels witness to the old relationship in the light of the new - even Matthew has to distinguish between an ordinary relationship to Jesus and one based on the revelation of God and faith. Insight into Jesus' identity cannot be based merely on history,

but on the revelation of God vouchsafed to faith in the resurrection, now seen by Matthew as having been anticipated by Peter. But even Matthew shows that Jesus' identity was not plain for all to see. Jesus was not Messiah in historical terms.

It is now plain that more is involved in the theme of the messianic secret than the historical question whether use of the title Messiah belonged to Jesus' lifetime. Even to concentrate merely on the question of the title Messiah is to narrow the field, since, in the gospels, the Son of Man title is also connected with the problem of concealment and secrecy as regards Jesus' identity. This was observed by Wrede too, though the fact has often gone unnoticed. Indeed in the gospels it would seem that use of the title Messiah is the problem, rather than the reverse. This is the result of the insight of Conzelmann that secrecy is introduced over against messianic, rather than unmessianic, tradition. Involved in the difficulty over Jesus' messiahship is his identification with the apocalyptic figure of the Son of Man, which itself appears as highly problematical and, as such, is used to explain the difficulty about Jesus' messiahship.

But it seems that the Son of Man material, so far as it identifies Jesus with the Son of Man, does not belong within

the context of Jesus' earthly life. Identification of Jesus with the coming Son of Man depends on his previous death and resurrection as expressed in the Marcan 'prophecies of the passion' (e. g. Mk. viii. 31), and description of the earthly Jesus as Son of Man belongs to the context of the kerygmatic collection of sayings material called 'Q' - whether indeed it was a collection as such or merely a cycle of tradition - which, in the context of the gospel narrative, involves paradox and concealment. The attempt of Eduard Schweizer to see the 'Q' Son of Man sayings as sayings of Jesus using an ambiguous title fails linguistically and on grounds of probability if not from this understanding - derived from Tödt - of the original context of the sayings in the kerygma and the way they have been built into the gospel narrative and thereby translated into the context of Jesus' Life. It is their present setting in the gospels which is the sole ground for Schweizer's claim that they are part of Jesus' ambiguous self-witness to his earthly ministry. The evangelists use the Son of Man sayings to interpret the difficulties about Jesus' messiahship positively, both in relation to the life of Jesus and to the Gospel, according to the way that double relation is expressed in the respective gospel narratives themselves: Jesus is, was, and will be the Son of Man, but only the par-

ousia will make that identity public knowledge and only the resurrection guarantees it.

To assert that messiahship was claimed for Jesus during his lifetime, or even that he may have conceived it of himself, is only to state the problem of which Jewish disbelief is indicative, which is, how the crucified Jesus could be the Messiah, and how the beliefs of the church about Jesus, based on the resurrection, themselves fit in with that conception. History and the Gospel unite in questioning Jesus' messiahship, and the problem is raised most acutely by the probable fact that the disciples of Jesus had themselves originally thought of Jesus in terms of messiahship, during his earthly life, but that their beliefs were questioned both by Jesus' behaviour and by subsequent events. The messiahship of Jesus was a problem from the start. But it emphasises the general problem of Jesus' identity, i.e. the relation between the life of Jesus and the post-resurrection faith of the church, which expressed itself christologically and demanded some adequate description of Jesus. If Mark is to be believed, the question about Jesus' messiahship stands for the problem of the relation between history and Gospel in the church's faith in Jesus and her Gospel of Jesus Christ.

The formulations of the church's faith already took this question into account in their descriptions of Jesus as the Son of Man who first died and rose again and of Jesus as the concealed Son of God. Mark presented this perspective of the primitive Gospel about Jesus in the form of an account of the historical Jesus, and hence placed emphasis of the secret of Jesus' messiahship, as something not accepted because not understood and not applicable during Jesus' lifetime before the resurrection, because it needed reinterpretation (Mk. xii. 35ff.). But this reinterpretation belongs after the resurrection, not before it, as is shown by the very insistence on secrecy itself with regard to Jesus' earthly life. The secrecy-theme - in its two complimentary aspects - is not a reflection of reinterpretation of the concept of messiahship by Jesus which demanded secrecy, nor an explanation of why messiahship was not thought of during Jesus' lifetime. It is an explanation of the fact that the disciples' original belief in Jesus' messiahship was invalid, and why Jesus did not accept it or act upon it. It has therefore more than a reference to the circumstances of Jesus' earthly life, as a secret kept by Jesus - though it may have its roots in Jesus' rejection of the disciples' belief in his messiahship (with no

indication of how he might accept the title at all) - but concerns the question of the relation between post-resurrection faith in Jesus and the circumstances and events of Jesus' earthly life, hence, the general question of the relation between history and the Gospel. The question of Jesus' self-consciousness was probably never asked in the first century, and, as Wrede said, cannot be answered.

On the basis of kerygmatic material, Mark has attempted to give a positive account of the relation between history, i.e. the life of Jesus as the presupposition for the Gospel, and the Gospel, itself following the resurrection, based on the secret about Jesus' messiahship and the disciples' lack of understanding as twin and complementary reflexions of the problem described above. Matthew and Luke, as already stated, have tried to systematize and rationalize the relation between history and the Gospel theologically and historically, with their own understandings of history in the light of the Gospel. They also presupposed the historical problem of Jesus' messiahship, as either a special revelation to the disciples to be understood later on the basis of the passion, or as something not understood until the passion had been understood. They depicted Jesus further in terms of the Son of Man as he is described in the tradition and in Mark. They saw concealment as an aspect of Jesus' life, epitomized

by the secrecy of his messiahship, and understood in terms of a hidden process of history. This development is secondary to and dependent on Mark, and not basic to the historical tradition, as Sjöberg contends. The identification of Jesus with the Son of Man appears too as an elucidation of the problem in the light of the post-resurrection faith in Jesus and expectation of his return, rather than the original ground for the secret in Jesus' lifetime, or as part of it (as Schweizer implies).

From this analysis we not only understand better an aspect of the gospel narrative, but the gospels themselves and the nature of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. We are also shown how we are to regard the question of the relation between history and the Gospel, how we are to regard the life of Jesus and the quest of the historical Jesus, and what we are to see as the basis of the proclamation of the church about Jesus.

The pattern of the life of Jesus emerges as one of unfulfilled eschatological proclamation on Jesus' part and unfulfilled messianic expectations on the disciples' part. The cross overshadows all, but is negated by the resurrection. After this the unfulfilment of Jesus' lifetime ceases to be so important. Both aspects are understood in christological terms and reinterpreted in terms of Jesus

as the Son of Man. Jesus' messiahship is then reaffirmed in terms of the Son of Man, though its historical inappropriateness is not questioned. The life of Jesus is then approached by the evangelists to show how the historical Jesus is the subject of the post-resurrection Gospel, and this involves reference to Jesus' eschatological preaching, ~~and~~ reinterpretation of eschatology in relation to christology and an understanding of history based on this reinterpretation. An understanding of history had after all been required both by the failure of eschatological expectation in the cross and the consequent reorientation with regard to and reflexion back on the life of Jesus and his preaching after the resurrection. The cross was the first crisis of the Christian church, by which it came into being. The Gospel presupposes the life of Jesus and itself reinterprets it. Both aspects are reflected in the gospels. Jesus' own preaching and deeds were included in the kerygma and were the basis of it. Their becoming the subject of it is also reflected in the gospels. A continuity with the historical Jesus is thus established by the Gospel on the basis of the resurrection, even though, as the secrecy-theme in the gospels shows, there remains a measure of discontinuity between the historical Jesus and the Christ of faith. There is no historical identification between the two, but one pro-

claimed by the Gospel on the basis of faith in the resurrection - hence the accent in the gospels on the necessity of faith for any meaningful relationship with Jesus.

This means that the church cannot claim a historical basis for its preaching, but is justified solely by its own faith. It is not allowed the kind of certainty and assurance refused to Peter in his assertion of Jesus' messiahship *and* the request for priority of the sons of Zebedee. The church's own preaching in history lies under the cross, like Jesus' own, and its own identity is as much a secret in history. But the church can rely on the revelation vouchsafed to it, even though its reliance and faith is under the cross, and its revelation comes to it through the cross. But the resurrection asserts that its faith is not in vain, any more than Jesus' eschatological faith in Gethsemane was in vain, if it does not desert its watch with Christ nor seek to dwell on the mount of transfiguration. It has the assurance of seeing its Master once more in Galilee and of having him present always in its preaching, and also of his waiting on the far side of history to receive it and confess it, as was the case with Stephen. This last assurance cancels out disappointment at the length of historical waiting, which in real terms cannot be longer than the individual's own lifetime. The

important thing is that the One who waits at the end and comes to meet us, is the one who walked in Galilee and is present still with his own. It is, however, one's own faith and confession of Jesus which matters, both now and in the future, and this is despite, and not because of, historical appearances and is in relation to that scandal of the historical Jesus which Paul recognized at the heart of the Gospel (I Cor. i. and ii, cf. Mk. viii. 38).

The common witness of the synoptic gospels is as follows. Secrecy is part of Jesus' messiahship, as much as belief in it depends on faith alone. It is only in accordance with these propositions that it can be proclaimed now. This proclamation goes beyond the circumstances and outcome of Jesus' earthly life because of the resurrection, whilst it is dependent on the kind of Messiah Jesus actually was and because, - the one who also personally fulfils his own eschatological message, and summons men throughout history to live with this faith, which transcends history and at the same time comes to terms with it. To those who have this resurrection-faith, like Jesus' own, is it granted to know and to proclaim Who He is.

References for Chapter Five

Conclusions

¹This is the development of the approach of form-criticism which has taken place.

²This witness of Matthew and Luke tells against those who would explain the secret in its setting biographically in that they must either claim that Mark's narrative is basically historically reliable over against the others, which is not proved against form-criticism and requires a reading into the material ~~of~~ connections and explanations not there, or that behind the three gospels there is a basic historical tradition, the basis for such an assertion not being apparent since the outline of Matthew and Luke is based on Mark.